



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE QUARTO-DECIMANS.

By JAMES DRUMMOND,  
Oxford.

THE principal purpose of this article is to examine an argument which was at one time advanced as a conclusive demonstration that the fourth gospel could not have proceeded from the apostle John, which is now abandoned as delusive even by some of those who reject the Johannine authorship, but which Dr. Martineau has pressed with undoubting confidence in his recent work, *The Seat of Authority in Religion*. His judgment gives a new vitality and interest to the question, which more than justifies a full examination of the evidence. The attractiveness of the subject, moreover, is by no means confined to its bearing on the gospel, but extends to the history of an ancient controversy and the growth of discipline in the church, so that the historian and antiquarian as well as the critic may find something congenial in its treatment.

The argument, as it affects the gospel, may be stated as follows: The synoptic gospels contain the primitive apostolic tradition, and they concur in the statement that Jesus partook of the regular Jewish passover on the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan (that is according to our mode of reckoning days, for with the Jews the evening was the beginning of the fifteenth), and consequently represent the crucifixion as taking place after the passover had been eaten. The fourth gospel, on the other hand, places the last supper on the evening of the thirteenth, and the crucifixion on the fourteenth, before the passover was eaten. We believe that, though the question is open to argument, this is probably a correct view of the facts; but it is important to remember in the present discussion that the altered dates in the fourth gospel are not made prominent, that they

entirely escape the notice of the casual reader, and have to be gathered from detached texts, to which, whether reasonably or not, different interpretations have been given.<sup>1</sup> It might be urged, at this point, that as the last gospel is at variance with the primitive apostolic tradition, and as John was one of the two disciples who were sent to prepare for the passover,<sup>2</sup> the claim of Johannine authorship becomes quite inadmissible. This, however, is only a particular instance of the larger argument founded on the unhistorical character of the work, and it is one of the instances in which the accuracy of the fourth gospel may be most plausibly defended. The present contention is of a different kind. The churches of the province of Asia, and some of the adjoining districts, celebrated Easter on the fourteenth day of the month at the time when the Jews kept the passover, and in defense of this custom they appealed to an ancient usage which had been sanctioned by the apostle John. It is maintained that this celebration must have been an annual commemoration of the Lord's Supper; that therefore John must have placed the last supper on the fourteenth, and cannot be the author of the gospel. If these points could be all established, the argument would certainly seem to be conclusive. A curious modification, however, which makes the argument much less telling, is introduced when it is denied that John was ever in Asia Minor at all, for then the Asiatic usage is severed from all connection with him, and he may have written the gospel which opposed that usage. The only thing that can be said in this case is that the gospel, being in conflict with the practice of the Asiatic churches, cannot have been received by them as a work of the apostle's. This last position has not, outside of the present argument, a particle of evidence; but if it could be established, the reply might fairly be made that they rejected it on dogmatic

<sup>1</sup> It would require a separate paper to discuss the various opinions which have been held both in ancient and modern times in regard to the precise historical facts, and in regard to the meaning of the gospel narratives and the possibility of harmonizing them with one another. Our opinion upon such points, however, does not seriously affect the substance of this essay, and I must be content with a provisional expression of my own view.

<sup>2</sup> Luke 22 : 8.

grounds, and because it was not written by a man that they foolishly confounded with the apostle, and that therefore their skepticism could not be set against the belief of the rest of Christendom. To maintain at the same time that the Asiatics had a correct tradition and impression of John's Judaic tendencies, and that all other traditions related to a man who was not the real John, is obviously absurd. We may, accordingly, confine ourselves to the most telling and consistent form of the argument; and as the whole question is one of considerable interest, I will go a little more into detail than the simple purpose of refutation requires.

Before entering on an account of the early controversy I may venture to remark that the very confidence with which the argument is pressed excites a preliminary suspicion that there must be a flaw in it, because it would legitimately lead to consequences which are quite contrary to the fact. Mr. Tayler, for instance, says: "The gospel which we find in general circulation under the name of John before the close of the second century contains statements respecting the last supper of Jesus with his disciples so entirely at variance with the belief on which the quartodecimans, as their very name implies, founded their practice, that, had they recognized it as a work of John, it is impossible that they could have appealed in their defense to his sanction. What is more remarkable still, those who were opposed to quartodeciman usage, and wished to enforce a catholic uniformity throughout the church, never once thought of appealing in the earlier stages of the controversy to the statement in the fourth gospel, which was decidedly in their favor. A word from one standing in so close a relation to Jesus as the beloved apostle would have settled the question forever. Yet not till quite the end of the second century do we find the name of John adduced to support the catholic view."<sup>3</sup> The reader naturally asks, Then why did not the appeal to the fourth gospel settle the question forever? The objectionable practice and the controversy continued for more than a century after the word was spoken by one who was believed to be the beloved apostle, and the dispute

<sup>3</sup> *An Attempt to Ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 1867, p. 117.

was settled at last by an appeal, not to John, but to Constantine. Yet the Asiatics were never charged with holding false views in regard to the gospel, but their entire orthodoxy, except in a point of discipline, was fully and frankly admitted. The argument, therefore, proves a great deal too much, and consequently creates a suspicion of some fundamental flaw.

We will now proceed to a brief historical sketch which will be a useful preparation for the discussion of details.

Eusebius<sup>4</sup> relates that in the closing years of the second century there was no small disputation because the parishes of all Asia (that is, probably, of the province), appealing to an ancient tradition, thought that they ought to observe the fourteenth day of the month as the feast of the passover of salvation,<sup>5</sup> the day on which the Jews were directed to kill the lamb. Accordingly on this day, on whatever day of the week it fell, they put an end to the fast, whereas the churches throughout all the rest of the world, following an apostolic tradition, thought it unbecoming to terminate it on any other than the day of our Saviour's resurrection. Synods of bishops were held; letters were circulated; and there was a concurrence of opinion that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection from the dead should not be celebrated on any other than the Lord's day, and that on this day alone should the fast at the passover be terminated. Several of these writings were extant in the time of Eusebius, and we should observe that among the bishops to whom he particularly refers are those of Pontus, for we thus learn that the quartodeciman view did not extend over the whole of Asia Minor. The bishops of Asia, however, were not convinced; and their leader, Polycrates, addressed a letter to Victor of Rome, defending their position. A portion of this letter has been preserved by Eusebius.<sup>6</sup> Polycrates says: "We therefore keep the day not in a reckless manner,<sup>7</sup> neither adding nor taking away. For in Asia also great lights have fallen asleep." He proceeds to specify Philip,

<sup>4</sup> *H. E.*, V, 23.

<sup>5</sup> Τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα, so-called, presumably, to distinguish the Christian from the Jewish passover.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

<sup>7</sup> Ἀραδιούργητον.

one of the twelve apostles, "and moreover, also, John, who leaned on the breast of the Lord, who became a priest, having worn the *petalon*, and martyr and teacher: he sleeps in Ephesus." Among more recent bishops, then deceased, he names Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papirius, Melito, and says that "these all kept the day of the passover on the fourteenth according to the gospel, transgressing in nothing, but following according to the rule of the faith." He himself followed the tradition of his relatives, among whom he was the eighth bishop. He had been sixty-five years in the Lord, had met with brethren from all parts of the world, had gone through every holy scripture, and was not alarmed, for those who were greater than he had said, "We must obey God rather than men." He could mention the bishops whom he had summoned at Victor's request, who were very numerous, and signified their approval of the epistle. Victor's reply to this letter was an attempt to excommunicate as heterodox the parishes of all Asia, together with the neighboring churches. So extreme a measure, however, did not meet with universal approval, and remonstrances were addressed to the bishop of Rome, urging him to have some regard for peace, and for unity and love towards his neighbors. Among others, Irenæus wrote in the name of the brethren in Gaul. He admitted that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection ought to be celebrated only on the Lord's day, but he admonished Victor not to cut off whole churches of God for observing an ancient custom. For, he added, the dispute was not only about the day, but about the very form of the fast, some fasting one day, some two or more; and these varieties, which arose at an earlier time from simplicity and ignorance, did not disturb their mutual peace, but the difference of the fast proved the harmony of the faith. He then proceeded to relate an event which carries back our history from thirty to forty years. The presbyters who presided over the church of Rome before Soter (going back as far as Xystus, 115-125 A. D., according to Lipsius) did not themselves observe [? the day], and nevertheless they remained at peace with those who came from the parishes in which it was observed, although the contrast was made more obvious by the

proximity. Never were any rejected, and the Roman presbyters, though not themselves observing, sent the eucharist to those who observed. And when the blessed Polycarp was staying at Rome in the time of Anicetus (155 A. D.), the latter could not persuade him not to observe, as he had always observed with John, the disciple of our Lord, and with the rest of the apostles with whom he associated; nor was Anicetus persuaded to observe, for he said that he ought to adhere to the custom of the presbyters before him. Nevertheless these two men had communion with one another, and in the church Anicetus allowed Polycarp to celebrate the eucharist, so that they parted in peace. Irenæus does not tell us, in the quotations which Eusebius has given, from what sources he derived his information; but he must have had ample opportunities of learning the facts, and I see no reason for calling them in question.

Returning to the time of Victor, we find an incident of some importance, which is related only too briefly by Eusebius.<sup>8</sup> The bishops of Palestine met together and drew up a letter in which they made a lengthened statement<sup>9</sup> about the tradition which had come down to them, from the succession of the apostles, in regard to the passover. On this most interesting point we are unfortunately left without information, and we cannot say to what apostles they appealed, or through what men the tradition had come down; but in comparing this with the Asiatic tradition we must remember that considerably more than a century had elapsed since the last apostle left Palestine, and that the country had been so distracted by insurrections and wars that there may well have been some break in the continuity of ecclesiastical customs, whereas in Asia our evidence professes to go back to the time of Polycarp, who was himself a disciple of John. Nevertheless the Palestinian bishops themselves attached great importance to their decision, for at the end of the letter they expressed a desire that a copy should be sent to every church, so that they might not be responsible for those who "easily led their own souls astray." They added that a letter had been received from Alexandria, from which it appeared that there also

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>9</sup> Πλεῖστα διεληφότες.

the same holy day was observed. That day, as we have seen, was a Sunday; but what Sunday we have not yet been told.

Eusebius gives us one other glimpse into the controversies about the passover in the second century.<sup>10</sup> Melito, bishop of Sardis, who is mentioned in the letter of Polycrates as a supporter of the Asiatic custom, wrote two books on the Passover. The historian quotes only three lines from this treatise, and tells us nothing of its purport; but we learn that it was written in consequence of a great controversy which arose in Laodicea about the passover, when Servilius Paulus was proconsul of Asia,<sup>11</sup> on occasion of the martyrdom of Sagaris. It is generally assumed that this controversy related to the point in dispute between the eastern and the western churches, and it is possible that on the death of Sagaris, who, as we have learned from Polycrates, was a quartodeciman bishop, there may have been an attempt to introduce the western custom; but we must bear in mind that this is pure conjecture, and does not rest on a particle of evidence. Irenæus, as we have seen, expressly tells us that the controversy was not only about the day; and this particular dispute may have been about the fast, or about the meaning to be attached to the day, or about the evangelical chronology. Be this as it may, Melito's work induced Clement of Alexandria to write a treatise of his own on the passover, but hardly as a formal reply, for Eusebius only says he has mentioned Melito's essay as the cause of his composition. Some fragments have come down to us of a work by Apollinaris of Hierapolis on the same subject,<sup>12</sup> and it has been supposed that it too was written in reply to Melito; but of this there is no evidence whatever, and it is certainly curious that critics who so readily disbelieve facts which are more or less strongly attested so confidently accept statements which are not supported by testimony of any kind. What the position of Apollinaris really was we shall have to consider further on.

In spite of the strong measures adopted by Victor the several churches continued in the observance of their respective

<sup>10</sup> *H. E.*, IV, 26.

<sup>11</sup> About 164-6 A. D.

<sup>12</sup> Preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*.



customs till the time of Constantine, and the settlement of this question was one of the objects with which the Council of Nicæa was summoned.<sup>13</sup> It was decreed that all should celebrate the paschal festival at the same time,<sup>14</sup> and a letter from the synod announced the good news that all the brethren in the East, who formerly kept the passover with the Jews, would henceforth act agreeably to the Roman practice.<sup>15</sup> Constantine himself appealed to the churches in a letter which deals with the question at some length.<sup>16</sup> But even these combined authorities were not sufficient to terminate the controversy. Epiphanius tells us that men were still writing and disputing about it in his time, and that the Audians persisted in keeping the passover with the Jews.<sup>17</sup> Some of the Novatians also, in the latter part of the fourth century, dissented from the general practice, in opposition to the custom of their own sect.<sup>18</sup> But we need not dwell upon these later events; for any details which throw light on the subject under consideration will be noticed in the following discussion.

We must now endeavor to interpret this ancient controversy, and examine its bearing on the Johannine authorship of the gospel. We must consider first the origin, extent, and meaning of the celebration known among the early Christians as the passover.<sup>19</sup>

There can, I think, be no doubt that it was imported into Christianity from Judaism, though probably from the first it received an altered significance. Jewish Christians would naturally keep the passover with their countrymen, but would do so in remembrance, no longer of the deliverance from Egypt, but of Christ; and as the Old Testament was accepted by the church as sacred Scripture, the ceremony would easily pass on to the Gentiles, who would look upon their own rite as the true and spiritual fulfillment of the law. That this was actually the course of events may be inferred from all the evidence at our disposal.

<sup>13</sup> SOCRATES, I, 8.

<sup>14</sup> SOZOMEN, I, xxi, 6.

<sup>15</sup> SOCRATES, I, 9.

<sup>16</sup> Given in EUSEB., *Vit. Con.*, III, 17-20; SOCRATES, I, 9; THEODORET, *Ec. Hist.* I, 9.

<sup>17</sup> *Haer.*, LXX, 9.

<sup>18</sup> SOCR. IV, 28; V, 21; VII, 5; SOZOM., VI, xxiv, 6-7; VII, xviii.

<sup>19</sup> Τὸ Πάσχα.

The name of the festival is simply a repetition in Greek letters of the Aramaic form of פֶּסַח, the Hebrew word for pass-over. The preservation of the same name points to continuity of practice; and we must observe that the use of this Jewish name is not local or temporary, but universal and permanent. Everywhere the old writers assume that the feast in question is the passover, and that it had been and was still kept by Jews as well as Christians. The significance of this fact is lost if we translate the word by our Easter; and I have therefore retained the translation which is habitually given to the Hebrew term.

How this festival of Jewish name was celebrated in the earliest times, and to what extent it partook of the character of the passover, our authorities do not inform us. In the fourth century it was regarded as the chief celebration in the year; the night before was turned into day by the splendor of the illuminations; and Easter day itself was kept with the utmost religious joy by all sections of the people.<sup>20</sup> No doubt the ceremonial would tend to become more magnificent as time went on; but from the first it must have had something to distinguish it from all other feasts, and to give appropriateness to the name by which it was called. The argument against the Johannine authorship of the gospel requires that at least its principal feature should have been the commemoration of the last supper on the presumed anniversary of the day when it was actually eaten; but this supposition is exposed to fatal objections. In the first place, it is totally destitute of evidence. Secondly, there would have been nothing distinctive in such a celebration, for the Lord's Supper was administered every week. But most important of all in our present inquiry is this, that if the question had been on what day it was proper to commemorate the last supper, the controversy must have had quite a different form from that which it actually assumed. The dispute could not have been between the fourteenth day of the month and the first day of the week, but must have been between the thirteenth and the fourteenth days of the month, the advocates of the former appealing to the fourth gospel.

<sup>20</sup>See details and authorities in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, article "Easter, ceremonies of."

There would then have been real ground for asserting an inconsistency between the alleged Johannine practice and the Johannine gospel; but of any question whether the thirteenth or fourteenth day should be kept there is not a trace. The western church might, however, have preferred regulating even the commemoration of the last supper by the day of the week, and not by the day of the year, but, if so, Thursday, and not Sunday, would have been the proper time. The supposition, therefore, that the passover was merely an annual celebration of the Lord's Supper must be discarded. With this conclusion the date of the last supper ceases to have anything to do with the controversy, and the argument collapses.

It has, however, been supposed that the eastern festival was much more Jewish in form than the western, whereas the fourth gospel wishes to separate the last supper from the passover. Even if this were true, it would not signify, unless the question had arisen in what form the last supper should be celebrated; but of this there is not a trace. Still it will be interesting to inquire how far the allegation can be sustained. All churches agreed, as we have seen, in calling the festival the passover, and thus recognizing its Jewish origin. In accordance with this name it was formerly supposed that at the time of the paschal controversy the whole church kept the Jewish passover, and that a lamb was slain; but afterwards it was admitted that this was not the case with the western church, but only with the eastern. But Schürer, on whose authority this statement is made, adds that even the latter view is now generally given up. He maintains that certainly the quartodecimans did not kill a lamb, for that portion of the celebration ceased even among the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, and even before that time the Jews living away from Palestine partook of an ordinary meal.<sup>21</sup> It may be doubted whether the argument from Jewish custom is conclusive. The Jews naturally dispensed with the lamb when the temple was destroyed; but the Christians recognized the church

<sup>21</sup> See his dissertation, *De controversiis paschalibus sec. p. Chr. n. sæc. exortis*, delivered July 26, 1869; translated in the *Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol.* (1870), which last I have used; § IV.

as the true temple of God, and its members as spiritual kings and priests; and they might therefore consider it proper to kill the lamb wherever they were residing, and may have adopted that custom before the destruction of Jerusalem. At all events we are not without some traces of this custom. Epiphanius, speaking of the manner in which "the holy church of God" celebrates the passover, says: "We take the sheep from the tenth day, recognizing the name of Jesus on account of the iota."<sup>22</sup> Elsewhere, having quoted the commandment to take a sheep from the tenth day of the month, and keep it till the fourteenth, he adds that the church continues to observe the feast of the passover, that is, the appointed week, following the arrangement of the apostles themselves, from the second day of the week, which is the purchasing of the sheep; and if the fourteenth day of the month fell on the second or any subsequent day of the week, the sacrifice of the sheep went on.<sup>23</sup> The quartodecimans also would seem to have used the sheep, for Epiphanius<sup>24</sup> urges, as an inconsistency in their practice, that, if they keep the passover on the fourteenth, they have need to take the sheep from the tenth, and keep it till the fourteenth, and so their fast would continue, not for one day, but for five. These passages certainly suggest a general practice of killing a sheep at the passover on the part of Christians. In the ninth century one of the charges brought by the Greek against the Roman church, and repudiated by the latter as false, was that they blessed and offered a lamb at the passover, according to the custom of the Jews, upon the altar, together with the Lord's body. The charge may have been untrue in its precise form; but that it was not without foundation appears from a reference by Walafrid Strabo to the error of some "who consecrated with a proper [or special] benediction the flesh of a [or 'the,' the Latin leaving it doubtful] lamb at the passover, placing it near or under the altar, and on the day of the resurrection partook of the flesh itself before other food for the body; and the order of this benediction," he adds, "is still observed by many."<sup>25</sup> The formula

<sup>22</sup> The first letter of the word Jesus, and the symbol for ten. *Haer.*, L, 3.

<sup>23</sup> *Haer.*, LXX, 12.

<sup>24</sup> L, 2.

<sup>25</sup> *De rebus eccles.*, chap. 18.

of benediction has been preserved,<sup>26</sup> and it is stated in one of the Roman rituals that a lamb was solemnly partaken of by the pope and eleven cardinals.<sup>27</sup> The lamb was roasted, and the benediction pronounced, and the whole ceremony was in imitation of the last supper, as, indeed, is expressly stated, "in figure of the twelve apostles around the table of Christ, when they ate the passover." The lamb is not brought into connection with the altar; and it was to such a connection, and not to the eating of the lamb, that the Greek church objected. The ceremony took place in the secretarium, after the celebration of mass in the church.<sup>28</sup> The pope, having partaken of the lamb, handed it to the next basilicarius, saying, "Quod facis, fac citius. Sicut ille accepit ad damnationem, tu accipe ad remissionem." Distribution was then made to the rest who were present.<sup>29</sup> At the same time a curious custom prevailed "in the Catholic church within the Roman state," which further illustrates the connection of Easter with the passover. The archdeacon molded a preparation of wax and oil into the likeness of lambs, and these wax lambs were distributed among the people in the church after mass and communion, on the Saturday following Easter Sunday, that, "as

<sup>26</sup> On the day of the holy passover, after the celebration of mass, the following Benedictio agni in pascha was pronounced in the secretarium: "Post celebratam Dominicæ sanctæ paschæ solennitatem, postque etiam transactos jejuniorum dies, jam animabus spiritualibus dapibus refectis de mensa tuæ majestatis, offerimus famuli tui pro hujus fragilitate corpusculi aliquantulum reparandi, hanc usui nostro concessam creaturam agni, poscentes ut eum ore proprio nobis signantibus benedicas, ac dextera tua sanctifices, et universis ex eo summentibus ministrata munuscula grata effici præstes, atque his cum gratiarum actione perceptis te DEUM, qui es cibus vitæ et animæ nostræ, magis et inhiante desideremus, et indefesse fruamur." This is immediately followed by a Benedictio aliarum carnium, in which there is an allusion to the command given to Moses and "thy people" to eat a lamb in Egypt, "in figura agni Domini nostri Jesu Christi, cujus sanguine omnia primogenita tibi de mundo redemisti." See MELCHIOR HITTORPIUS, *De divinis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Officiis ac Ministeriis*, Coloniz, 1568, where an *Ordo Romanus* is printed from an old manuscript. The above quotations are from p. 79. There is a full account of the offices for the entire period of Easter celebration; but the above are sufficient for our purpose.

<sup>27</sup> See GIESELER, *Kirchengesch.*, II, i, § 41, note 12, to which my attention was called by J. J. Tayler, p. 122, note.

<sup>28</sup> See the account quoted in note 26 from Melchior Hittorpius.

<sup>29</sup> See MABILLON'S *Museum Italicum*: Luteciæ Parisiorum, 1687-9, the *Ordo Romanus* auctore Benedicto (written before 1143), Tom. II, p. 142; also auct. Cencio, pp. 186-7.

the children of Israel in Egypt inscribed the sign T on the thresholds of their houses, that they might not be smitten by the angel, so we also ought to write this sign on the threshold of our houses by faith, from the blood of the passion of the Immaculate Lamb, Christ, lest we be smitten by the devil and by faults."<sup>30</sup> Urban V (1362-1370) sent the emperor (Charles IV) one of these wax lambs as "a great gift," accompanied by some Latin verses, which show that it was expected to act as a charm.<sup>31</sup> In the foregoing accounts it is clear that the survival of the proper passover was also a memorial of the last supper, and at the same time of the death of Christ as the true Paschal Lamb. It was not, however, celebrated on either the thirteenth or fourteenth of the month, but on Easter Sunday, when it brought the days of the fast to a close. The connection with the passover has not been wholly forgotten in later times. In the *Missale Romanum* authorized by the Council of Trent Easter is still the *dies paschæ*, and "on this day particularly" thanks are given to God, because "Christ our passover was sacrificed; for he is the True Lamb, who has taken away the sins of the world." Even the paschal symbols have not wholly disappeared from modern times. The following statements of Cardinal Wiseman's are interesting: "The midnight service of Easter eve, now performed on Saturday morning, gives a similar coincidence;<sup>32</sup> a stronger authority for this connection.<sup>33</sup> Before the mass new fire is struck and blessed, and a large candle, known by the name of the paschal candle, being blessed by a deacon, is there-with lighted. . . . This year<sup>34</sup> being the seventh of the pontificate of the present pope, you will have the opportunity of witnessing another very ancient rite, only performed every seventh year of each reign. This is the blessing of the *Agnus Dei*, waxen cakes stamped with the figure of a lamb. It will take place in the Vatican palace on Thursday in Easter week, and a distribution of them will be made in the Sistine chapel on the follow-

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* in several "Orders," pp. 31, 138, 144 f., 163, 202, 375 f., 509 f.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, *Ordo* auct. J. Gaietano, p. 377.

<sup>32</sup> Referring to lighting the church with twenty-four candles.

<sup>33</sup> Between the lights and their mystical application.

<sup>34</sup> 1839.

ing Saturday. The origin of this rite seems to have been the very ancient custom of breaking up the paschal candle of the preceding year, and distributing the fragments among the faithful. Durandus, one of the eldest writers on church ceremonies, tells us that "on Saturday in Holy Week the acolytes of the Roman church made lambs of new blessed wax, or of that of the old paschal candle, mixed with chrism, which the pope, on the following Saturday, distributed to the faithful."<sup>35</sup> The Prayer-book of the Church of England introduces the words "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" at morning prayer on Easter day. Mr. Tayler<sup>36</sup> refers also to the practice of the Armenian Christians, who not only ate a lamb on Easter Sunday, but actually smeared their doorposts with its blood.<sup>37</sup>

These instances certainly "justify the conclusion that in the Christian pascha there was a gradual transition from Jewish to Christian usage,"<sup>38</sup> or perhaps we should rather say, a gradual dropping of Jewish symbolism for Christian facts; but it seems to me a very strange inference that "the original dispute between the quartodecimans and the Catholics related to something more fundamental than a mere reckoning of days,"<sup>39</sup> for the instances which are cited point to Catholic practice, and Mr. Tayler himself has to concede that "Jewish usage lingered longer in the West than in the East," and that this is "contrary to what might have been expected from the earlier stages of the controversy." It would be truer to say that it is contrary to the hypothesis on which Mr. Tayler's argument is so largely based. We should observe also that the distinction between quartodecimans and Catholics is quite misleading for the period to which our inquiry properly belongs. The quartodecimans were Catholics,

<sup>35</sup> DURAND, *Rationale Divin. Offic.*, lib. VI, cap. 69, p. 349. Wiseman's work is entitled, *Four lectures on the offices and ceremonies of Holy Week, as performed in the papal chapels*. By NICHOLAS WISEMAN, D.D., 1839, pp. 104-6. My attention was called to this work by the Rev. C. Hargrove. Lambs made of sweetmeats may be seen in abundance in the shops in Rome at Easter.

<sup>36</sup> P. 122, note.

<sup>37</sup> Mr. F. C. Conybeare tells me that this is still the case; only they kill a sheep, not a lamb; and that the Greeks have the same practice.

<sup>38</sup> TAYLER, p. 122.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

and in spite of Victor remained within the communion of the church.

If we pass for a moment to another region, a similar testimony reaches us from eastern Syria. In a Homily on the passover written by Aphraates in the year 343-4 there is a passage in which the Christian festival is shown to correspond, point by point, with the ancient institution. The Redeemer himself was the lamb, of whom not a bone was broken; and most of the ceremonies receive a spiritual or figurative interpretation. But a real lamb seems to have been offered as a symbol of the Lamb of God, for the commandment not to eat the passover raw or boiled with water is explained quite literally: "The sacrifice which is offered in the church of God is roasted at the fire; and it is not boiled, and is not offered raw." Such language is not applicable to the elements of the eucharist, and must refer to an actual lamb; and this inference is confirmed by a sentence a little further on: "And if he says 'Eat it as men who hasten away,' this is fulfilled in the church of God in this wise, that they eat the lamb 'as men who hasten away,' standing on their feet."<sup>40</sup>

So far, then, the evidence seems to warrant our saying that in the church generally the passover was a continuation of the Jewish festival, and resembled it sufficiently to justify the retention of the ancient name; and that, if a lamb was eaten, this practice was certainly not distinctive of the quartodecimans.

The church retained a clear consciousness of the connection between its own passover and the Jewish, and, though altering the day of celebration, appealed to the original commandment as of fundamental importance in determining the proper date for the observance. Thus the writer of the Paschal Chronicle (about 630 A. D.) calls attention to the fact that "the law expressly prescribes the holy and blessed passover of God, at the same time indicating the month in which one ought to do this, and ordering the day to be observed with great accuracy,"

<sup>40</sup> See *Aphrahat's des persischen Weisen Homilien aus dem Syrischen übersetzt und erläutert* von DR. GEORG BERT: in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, III, 3; Hom., XII, § 6, p. 191.



and proceeds to show why the Christians, though basing their calculations upon that day, postpone the keeping of the festival till the following Sunday.<sup>42</sup> But the legal passover was only shadowy and typical; Christ himself was the True Lamb in the feast of the passover, as the evangelist John teaches, and suffered in the feast. This is also written by the blessed Paul.<sup>43</sup> Accordingly, when the typical and shadowy passover was brought to an end by being fulfilled, "the genuine passover of the holy catholic and apostolic church of God began, in memory of which every year the church of God celebrates the holy feast of the passover, keeping without error the fourteenth day of the first lunar month, in which the legal passover was ordered to be observed;" but if this fell upon the Lord's day, the celebration was postponed till the following Sunday.<sup>43</sup> It is clear, then, that even at a comparatively late period the church professed to keep the passover in obedience to the requirement of "the divine law,"<sup>44</sup> only departing from the letter of the commandment, as it did in other instances, and filling the shadowy form with a Christian significance. There is nothing in the earlier accounts inconsistent with this view, while some points are, as we shall see, distinctly confirmed; so that we may, I think, regard it as established that the Christian passover was a continuation of the Jewish, more or less modified to suit Christian ideas.

We must now inquire whether there was any material difference between the Asiatic and the other churches except in regard to the time of observance; for it is sometimes thought that the quartodecimans kept the feast in a much more Jewish way, and that one object of the fourth gospel was to detach the festival from everything connected with Judaism. At first sight some of the allusions to the controversy may seem to justify this opinion. Socrates, in introducing the subject, contents himself

<sup>42</sup> Pp. 28 ff., ed. DINDORF, Bonn, 1832.

<sup>43</sup> P. 10 f.

<sup>43</sup> P. 16. See also p. 419; and p. 423 f. where it is said that the apostles handed it down to the churches to keep the fourteenth of the first lunar month, and the writer adds as a reason for putting off the celebration till the following Sunday, "that we may not feast with the Jews." Epiphanius also says the law was not destroyed, but fulfilled, the type was not annulled, but presented the truth (*Haer.*, I, 2).

<sup>44</sup> See p. 29, line 21.

with saying that some were anxious to celebrate the feast in too Jewish a way.<sup>45</sup> Sozomen uses similar language,<sup>46</sup> and refers to quartodecimans as those who imitate the Jews.<sup>47</sup> On this subject the letter of Constantine speaks very strongly. It seemed unworthy to celebrate the most holy feast conformably to the custom of the Jews. Let there be nothing common with the most hateful mob of the Jews. We should have no communion with the practices of such wicked men, the slayers of the Lord. Eusebius, too, in referring to the discussion of the passover question at the Council of Nicæa, says that finally the easterns gave way, and thus one festival of Christ was established, and they withdrew from the slayers of the Lord, and joined their fellow-believers, for nature draws like to like.<sup>48</sup> These statements, if they stood alone, might lead us to suppose that the general body of the church was bitterly hostile to a Jewish mode of celebrating the passover, to which the quartodecimans tenaciously clung. But the moment we ask what it was that was Jewish in the quartodeciman practice, this supposition is dispelled. There is one invariable answer: The Jews were not to prescribe the time of the church's festival. Constantine says that the controversy was "about the most holy day of the passover," and the decision of the council was that all, everywhere, should keep it on one and the same day. Sozomen also says that "it seemed good to the synod that all should keep the paschal festival at the same season," and mentions no other point of dispute.<sup>49</sup> It is to this single question that all the arguments are directed, and I cannot recall any charge against the quartodecimans of following the Jews in any other objectionable particular. The argument, therefore, founded on the contrary supposition completely breaks down.

But we are not without positive evidence that it was only

<sup>45</sup> I, 8.

<sup>46</sup> I, xvi, 4.

<sup>47</sup> VII, xviii, 10.

<sup>48</sup> From a writing "On the Feast of the Passover," printed in MAI, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, IV, pp. 209-216, § 8. This is a large section of the work on the Passover presented by Euseb. to Constantine, preserved by Nicetas, Serrarum Episcopus (end of the eleventh century), in his great manuscript catena to Luke. See Editoris monitum, prefixed to the extract.

<sup>49</sup> I, xxi, 6.

the scruple about the day which separated the quartodecimans from their brethren. Polycrates, in his letter, says, "We therefore keep the day without recklessness, neither adding nor taking away," and, having referred to the apostles and bishops whose authority he followed, declares that these all kept the fourteenth day "according to the gospel, transgressing in nothing, but following according to the rule of the faith." This, I think, is equivalent to a statement that, except in regard to the day, they followed the general practice of Christendom. It was on account of this single peculiarity that Victor wished to excommunicate them. It is to this that Irenæus addresses himself in his remonstrance. He refers, indeed, to differences of practice about the length of the fast, but this is only to convince Victor that mere varieties of usage cannot justify an excommunication. It seems clear that the Roman bishop had not included the nature of the fast in his indictment, and in any case this had nothing to do with Judaism. The testimony of Hippolytus is explicit. He ranks the quartodecimans among heretics, and describes them as "of a quarrelsome nature, un-instructed in knowledge, too contentious in disposition;" and still he has nothing to bring against them except their observance of the fourteenth day. "In everything else," he says, "they agree with all the things handed down to the church by the apostles."<sup>50</sup> Epiphanius also says, "They hold everything as the church," but in regard to the passover have been led astray by Jewish fables. The only Judaism which he ascribes to them is their adhesion to the fourteenth day, and the practice of the church which he justifies is the departure from the Jewish day.<sup>51</sup> In speaking of the Audians, a sect who followed the quartodeciman practice, he explains what is meant by "observing the passover with the Jews;" "that is," he says, "at the season in which the Jews keep their feast of unleavened bread, then they themselves are eager to hold the passover."<sup>52</sup>

Not only, then, is there no ground for the assertion that the quartodecimans clung to a peculiarly Jewish mode of celebration, which had been sanctioned by the apostle John, and was

<sup>50</sup> *Ref. omn. haer.*, VIII, 18.

<sup>51</sup> *Haer.*, L.

<sup>52</sup> *Haer.*, LXX, 9.

repudiated by the evangelist and the majority of the church, but such a notion is distinctly contrary to all the evidence we possess.

We must now inquire a little more fully into the character and meaning of the celebration. It was a festival, a time of rejoicing. This would follow from its being regarded as the passover, for the passover is always spoken of as a feast, and was signalized, not by a fast, but by a characteristic meal. Accordingly, the Christian passover is referred to as a feast so constantly that it is needless to refer to particular instances. I will notice only two writers who dwell upon its festive character. Eusebius alludes to it as a more splendid feast than that of the Jews. It took place at the most delightful time of the year, and at this season the Saviour of the whole cosmos, the great luminary, lightened the world with the rays of piety, and peoples everywhere kept the feast of their liberation from manifold atheism. Therefore no labor was allowed, but they imitated the rest which they hoped for in heaven; "whence not even in our prayers do we bend the knee, nor do we afflict ourselves with fasts." So full of joy was the time that they feasted for seven whole weeks, till "another great feast," pentecost, came in.<sup>53</sup> Gregory Nazianzen dwells in exalted language on the splendor of this "feast of feasts and assembly of assemblies."<sup>54</sup> To the general testimony I know of but one exception. Tertullian alludes to "the day of the passover, in which there is a common and, as it were, public religious observance of a fast."<sup>55</sup> Here, however, the writer is not describing the Easter ceremonial, but merely refers to the more public character of the fast which then took place, in contrast with the more private fasts which it was possible to conceal; and we may therefore assume that he is describing, not a characteristic of the day in the African churches, but a characteristic of the fast which, as we shall see, was terminated at the supposed hour of the resurrection, on Easter morning. This interpretation is confirmed by another passage, where are the

<sup>53</sup> In *MAI*, §§ 2-5.

<sup>54</sup> Quoted in *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 428.

<sup>55</sup> *Jejunii religio*; *De Orat.*, 18.

words, "When Jeremiah says, 'and I will gather them from the ends of the earth in a festive day,' he signifies the day of the passover and of pentecost, which is properly a festive day."<sup>56</sup> "Festive day" seems intended to describe either day indifferently. Be this as it may, there can be no doubt that with the mass of Christians the passover was kept as a festival, a time of rejoicing. Was this also the case with the quartodecimans? If I correctly understand Mr. Tayler, he thinks not. He maintains that the Jewish Christians "kept as the oldest Christian pascha the anniversary of the farewell supper on the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan."<sup>57</sup> A little farther on he says that "an obvious contrariety was soon experienced between the Jewish and the Christian idea associated with the word pascha. To the Jew it expressed rejoicing—the memory of deliverance; to the Christian it suggested, in the first instance, the remembrance of sorrow and loss, the death of his benefactor and best earthly friend. To the one it was a festival; to the other it was a fast."<sup>58</sup> But, strangely enough, when we pass over a few pages we meet with the following objection to the theory that the quartodecimans commemorated, not the last supper, but the death of Christ: "If the death-day of Christ was observed on the fourteenth of Nisan, it must have been observed as a fast day, and would, therefore, have been in harmony with the prolonged course of fasting which preceded the anniversary of the resurrection. But the complaint against the quartodecimans, as we have seen, was this: that by keeping the fourteenth of Nisan they interrupted with a feast, which the old pascha or passover properly was, the continuous fasting of passion week."<sup>59</sup> This is, I believe, perfectly correct as a statement of the fact; but then it is not easily reconciled with the previous passage, and it is quite as fatal to Mr. Tayler's own view as to the one against which it is urged. It becomes necessary, however, to examine the evidence relating to the quartodecimans' usage on this point.

We have already seen that the one charge brought against them was that they kept the passover on the wrong day, and

<sup>56</sup> *De Baptismo*, 19.

<sup>57</sup> P. 114.

<sup>58</sup> P. 115.

<sup>59</sup> P. 121 f.

there is not a particle of evidence that they violated the practice common to Jews and Christians, of treating the celebration as a feast. Eusebius says, "They thought they ought to keep the fourteenth day of the moon at the *feast* of the saving passover," so that it was necessary to terminate the fast on that day, whatever day of the week it might be, whereas the other churches thought they ought not to break the fast except on the day of the resurrection; and to this effect was the decision come to by various synods.<sup>60</sup> This clear statement is confirmed by the letter of Constantine. His objection to the quartodecimans is that they "fulfilled that most holy *feast* in conformity with the custom of the Jews." He thought it most impious that there should be discord in regard to such a feast, for the day of our liberty which the Saviour handed down was one; and it was "unbecoming that in the same days some should be devoted to fasts, and others be holding banquets, and that after the days of the passover some should be engaged in feasts and recreation, and others be given to the appointed fasts." The sum of the whole matter was that the minority gave way, and "it was agreeable to the common judgment of all that the most holy *feast* of the passover should be celebrated on one and the same day." All this is so explicit that there can be no doubt what was the nature of the question in the time of Constantine, and what Eusebius believed it to have been in the time of Polycrates. Eusebius had all the documents before him, and in the passages which he quotes there is nothing inconsistent with this view. The whole dispute turns on the observance of one day rather than another. The fragment from the letter of Irenæus, too, while pointing out that different churches had different usages in regard to the character and length of the fast, makes no suggestion that the quartodecimans regarded the passover itself as a fast; and his language is fully explained by the supposition that their one error consisted in keeping the feast too soon. We need have no hesitation, therefore, in accepting Eusebius' testimony, and believing that from first to last this was the one point which caused a division in the church. I may add that among hereti-

<sup>60</sup> *H. E.*, V, 23.

cal sects, Montanists, Novatians, Audians, which conformed more or less closely to the Jewish time, there is no hint that the passover was ever anything but a feast.<sup>61</sup> To this extent, then, the whole church remained "Jewish," that the passover bore distinctly the marks of a festival.

The celebration was, as we have seen, preceded by a fast. This was under no fixed rule, but was of varying length in different places. Irenæus, in his letter, says some fasted one day, others two, others more, and some for forty hours of day and night. By the time of Eusebius the fast had extended to six weeks, or, more exactly, forty days, in imitation of the zeal of Moses and Elijah.<sup>62</sup> But we learn from Socrates that even in his time this was not a universal custom; for instance, the Romans only fasted for three weeks, making an exception of Saturday and Sunday.<sup>63</sup> In Constantinople and the surrounding countries as far as Phœnicia they extended the fast to seven weeks, while the Montanists restricted it to two.<sup>64</sup> As the church was without a fixed rule in regard to the duration of the fast, so was it with respect to the precise character of the abstinence,<sup>65</sup> and the meaning to be attached to it. With Eusebius it was "a symbol of sorrow, on account of our former sins, and in memory of the saving passion."<sup>66</sup> I am not aware, however, that there is any ground for attributing this meaning to it in earlier times. A distinct memorial of the passion would not have lasted for forty days, and it seems most likely that the fast was originally an ascetic preparation for the great festival of the redemption; that its length was determined by local feeling or by Old Testament examples; and that everyone attached to it such significance as the season and a time of self-discipline suggested. That the passion should be specially remembered on the previous Friday is only what we should expect. We need not, however, dwell further on these varieties of usage. Sufficient has been said to show that for centuries the church was largely tolerant of local

<sup>61</sup> See SOZOMEN, VI, xxiv, 6, 7; VII, xviii; SOCRATES, V, 21, 22; EPIPH., *Haer.*, L, 1; LXX, 9.

<sup>62</sup> In MAL, §§ 4-5.

<sup>64</sup> SOZOMEN, VII, xix, 7.

<sup>66</sup> In MAL, § 11.

<sup>63</sup> V, 22.

<sup>65</sup> SOCR., *ibid.*

custom. An exception was made in regard to the quartodeciman peculiarity because the passover was the great festival of the year, and, as Constantine said, it seemed unbecoming that Christians should not unite in the time of its celebration. Other differences were quite subordinate, and did not mark such an obvious line of separation within the Christian church.<sup>67</sup>

That the fast terminated, at the latest, very early on Easter morning we know from express testimony. The first part of a letter addressed by Dionysius of Alexandria to his "beloved son and brother Basilides" relates to this question.<sup>68</sup> This Basilides, who, as we learn from Eusebius,<sup>69</sup> was bishop of the parishes in Pentapolis, had consulted Dionysius about the hour for concluding the fast. He did so owing to a difference of opinion among the brethren, some thinking they should do it at cock-crow, others "from the evening" (that is the evening before Easter Sunday), the brethren in Rome, as was alleged, following the former practice, "those here" (in Egypt, or perhaps the East generally) closing the fast sooner. He was at a loss how to fix an exact hour; for while it would be "acknowledged by all alike" that they ought to begin their festivities after the time of the resurrection of our Lord, and to humble their souls with fasts up to that time, the gospels contained no exact statement of the hour at which he rose. Dionysius in reply considers the accounts in the gospels, and then pronounces his opinion for the guidance of those who inquire at what hour or half hour or quarter of an hour they ought "to begin the rejoicing at the resurrection of our Lord from the dead." He blamed as negligent those who were in too great a hurry, and ended the fast before midnight; he highly applauded those who held out till the fourth watch; and those who took an intermediate position he would not molest, for all were not equally tolerant of the six days of fasting, and these days were kept with very different degrees of strictness. Mr. Tayler<sup>70</sup> says that the "strong assertion" in this passage (that all would acknowledge that the fast should ter-

<sup>67</sup> For fuller information and references about the fast see SCHÜRER, § VII.

<sup>68</sup> A careful edition of the letter is contained in ROUTH, *Reliq. Sac.*, III, pp. 223 ff.

<sup>69</sup> *H. E.*, VII, 26.

<sup>70</sup> P. 112.



minate at the hour of the resurrection) "should be noticed, as marking the point which the triumph of the Catholic principle had already reached," and, further, that "it is quite evident . . . that in the time of Dionysius the word *πάσχα*, in the view which had then become predominant in the Catholic church, had passed on from its original association with the fourteenth of Nisan to a fixed position in the first day of the week, on which Christ was believed to have risen, and had acquired a meaning equivalent to our Easter, as the anniversary of the resurrection." These remarks appear to me to be very misleading; for they surely imply that the state of things portrayed in the epistle was comparatively recent, and that the general body of the church had once been quartodeciman, and had undergone a gradual change, which was still in progress. But of this there is not a particle of evidence. When we first hear of the question, the Roman custom is fully established, and believed to rest on a very early tradition. When it was introduced it is impossible to say with confidence; but there is no ground of any sort for the implied suggestion that the Churches of Rome and Alexandria were ever quartodeciman. Whether the passover commemorated only the resurrection will appear in the sequel.

Before leaving the subject of the fast we must observe that the night before the day of the passover was spent in a vigil. The reason for this observance was twofold: because in it Christ returned to life after his passion, and was, in it, to receive his kingdom.<sup>71</sup> Jerome relates a tradition of the Jews that Christ would come in the middle of the night, as in the Egyptian time when the passover was celebrated; and to this he traces the apostolic tradition that in the day of the vigil of the passover it was not allowable to dismiss the people before midnight, while they awaited the advent of Christ. After that time, presuming that they were secure, all kept the festal day.<sup>72</sup> Now a narrative in Sozomen<sup>73</sup> connects the feast of the resurrection

<sup>71</sup> LACTANT, *Div. Inst.*, VII, 19. See an account of the vigil in *Constit. Apost.*, V, 19.

<sup>72</sup> See GIESELER, *Kirch.*, I, i, § 53, note 11. See, also, SOCRATES, VII, 5, "the accustomed vigil."

<sup>73</sup> VIII, xxi.

with this vigil, and distinguishes it from the passover. He tells us that after the deposition of John (Chrysostom), "when the forty days' fast was already ceasing, in the sacred night itself in which the annual festival in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ is celebrated, his partisans were driven out of the church," and on the following day they celebrated the passover in a public bath, under bishops and presbyters and the rest whose function it is to administer ecclesiastical affairs. This seems to imply that even at this late period the distinctive feast of the resurrection took place at night, at the proper hour for the cessation of the fast, and that the passover, whatever may have been the mode of its celebration, was a separate rite, with its own significance. It is therefore not safe to assume that in the Catholic church the passover had become simply "the anniversary of the resurrection," though, as we shall see, the memory of Christ's triumph over death entered largely into the Christian interpretation of the festival.

In endeavoring to ascertain the meaning of the Christian passover we may begin with a late writer, whose statements are sufficiently full and explicit. The writer of the Paschal Chronicle, having remarked that Christ, as the True Lamb, was sacrificed for us at the feast of the legal passover, and rose the third day, when the priest was required to offer the sheaf, says that the typical passover was brought to an end, the real passover having come. In memory of this the church kept the feast of the passover every year; and the writer describes this as "the holy feast of the resurrection of Christ our God from the dead."<sup>74</sup> Although the passover is here called the feast of the resurrection, it is clear from what goes before that the memory of the passion was included. The resurrection was the crowning event, and presupposed the death, whereas the death did not necessarily presuppose the resurrection; and accordingly a reference to the resurrection might include both the death of the True Lamb and the presentation of the first fruits from the dead. Elsewhere the author points out the propriety of celebrating the feast of salvation after Christ's resurrection, which took place on the sixteenth

<sup>74</sup>P. 15 f.

of the month,<sup>75</sup> and from this year Christians began to keep the quickening feast of the resurrection.<sup>76</sup> It appears, however, that there were some who blamed the church for applying the name of *πάσχα* to the feast of the resurrection, not knowing apparently the meaning of the word;<sup>77</sup> for it is a Hebrew term signifying a passing over, a going out, an overstepping. The church, therefore, necessarily applies the name of *πάσχα* not only to the passion of the Lord, but also to his resurrection; for it is through his passion and resurrection that human nature has obtained the passing over, and going out, and overstepping of him who has the dominion of death; for if the death of Christ bestowed this boon upon us, much more his resurrection, when he rose from the dead, the first fruits of them that slept. The Israelites were instructed to call only the fourteenth day passover, owing to the events of their history; but the church, for the reason given, necessarily assigns this name not only to the passion and death of Christ but also to his resurrection. The author concludes his discussion with the words, "Christ our passover was sacrificed and rose for us, and we call the death and the resurrection of the Lord passover."<sup>78</sup> It is clear, then, that in the opinion of this writer of the seventh century the passover was a commemoration of the two great acts of redemption, but that there was a tendency to lay the chief stress on the closing act of triumph over death.

As the passover had this twofold reference, it is not surprising that earlier writers allude to it sometimes under one of its aspects, sometimes under the other. Sozomen speaks of the "first day of the resurrection feast."<sup>79</sup> The feast as a whole would naturally commemorate the more joyful event, and yet the first day, the proper passover, might seem to unite it with the passion, which had just preceded. Socrates accordingly assigns to the "feast of the passover" "the memory of the saving passion."<sup>80</sup> Going back to a still earlier time, we find that Constantine describes it as "the feast from which we have received the

<sup>75</sup> P. 413 f.<sup>76</sup> P. 420.<sup>77</sup> The writer probably refers to a confusion between this word and *πάσχω*.<sup>78</sup> Pp. 424 ff.<sup>79</sup> VII, xix, 6.<sup>80</sup> V, 22.

hope of immortality," and yet in the same letter he says that "our Saviour has handed down as one the day of our liberty, that is, the day of the most holy passion." Eusebius combines the two ideas, but makes the memory of the passion the more prominent. The Jewish passover, he says, was only typical, as is proved by Paul's saying, "Christ our passover was sacrificed for us." The Baptist gives the reason for the sacrifice: "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world."<sup>81</sup> It is clear that the passion is here the uppermost thought; and we must observe that Eusebius sees no inconsistency between this and a feast of liberty,<sup>82</sup> and the celebration of that feast on the Lord's day. Indeed he insists that, whereas the Jews killed the sheep of the passover only once a year, "we of the new covenant on each Lord's day celebrate our own passover, are always filled with the saving body, always participate in the blood of the sheep, always gird up the loins of our soul with purity and sobriety, are always delivered from Egypt; for we must do these things, not once a year but every day." "Wherefore also every week we celebrate the feast of our passover, on the saving and dominical day, of the True Sheep, through whom we were redeemed, fulfilling the mysteries."<sup>83</sup> And again he says that we ought to eat the passover with Christ, removing from our minds all the leaven of wickedness, and anointing the doorposts of our mind with the blood of the Sheep sacrificed for us; and this not at one period of the whole year, but every week.<sup>84</sup> And yet again he says, "We celebrate the same mysteries through the whole year, fasting every Friday in memory of the saving passion, and every Lord's day quickened by the sanctified body of the same saving passover and sealing our souls with his precious blood."<sup>85</sup> The weekly celebration referred to must be the Lord's Supper; and we are thus reminded that even the Lord's Supper was not a mere memorial of Christ's farewell meal, but commemorated the new covenant and the price which was needed for its ratification, the body broken and the blood shed upon the cross; and in declaring the Lord's death until he came it at least suggested the thought of the resurrection. But I do not think

<sup>81</sup> In *MAI*, § 1.

<sup>82</sup> § 3.

<sup>83</sup> § 7.

<sup>84</sup> § 11.

<sup>85</sup> § 12.

we can infer from the words of Eusebius that the passover consisted only of the Lord's Supper; for he clearly implies that there was an annual festival which must have been distinguished in some way from the weekly service. He only extends the name to the Lord's Supper because it was a constant memorial of the true Passover Lamb, and ought to be followed by the spiritual results which were symbolized by the Jewish ceremonial.

A little earlier, Peter, bishop of Alexandria,<sup>86</sup> quotes from one Trecentius the statement, "For we have no other purpose than to keep the memory of his passion, and at the time when those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses have handed down."<sup>87</sup> This description of the feast is not called in question by the bishop, whose object it is to refute the view of Trecentius that the Jews were always in error, and that even their ancient celebration of the passover had nothing to do with Christians. We may, therefore, accept this as another example of the indifference with which the feast was described as a commemoration of the passion or of the resurrection. Going back for another century, we find that Tertullian, in recommending suitable days for baptism, connects the passover with the passion,<sup>88</sup> while he reserves the resurrection for Pentecost;<sup>89</sup> but this is quite an incidental expression suggested by another subject, and can hardly be taken as a proof that the African church did not commemorate the resurrection as well as the passion at their passover.

We must now turn to the quartodecimans. We have already seen that the only point of controversy between them and the rest of catholic Christendom related to the day of celebration. We might, therefore, infer that they too kept the passover in memory of the passion and resurrection; and this inference is confirmed by such evidence as we possess. According to Eusebius, in whose time, we must remember, the controversy was still agitating the church, the quartodecimans kept the feast of the

<sup>86</sup> Appointed 300 A. D.

<sup>87</sup> *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 7.

<sup>88</sup> Cum et passio domini in qua tinguimur adimpleta est.

<sup>89</sup> *De Baptismo*, 19.

passover on the day on which the Jews were commanded to kill the sheep, and thus terminated the fast without regard to the day of the week, whereas the rest of Christendom thought the fast ought not to be broken except on the day of the resurrection, and a decree was issued by letters from various synods that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection from the dead should not be celebrated except on the Lord's day, and on this day alone they should bring the fast to an end.<sup>90</sup> Here it is evident that in the church at large the memory of the resurrection was an essential part of the celebration; and it is equally clear that it was so with the quartodecimans, for the point of the objection to them is not that they confined their commemoration to the last supper or to the passion, but that they broke the fast, and thereby commemorated the resurrection too soon. No doubt the killing of the sheep reminded them as well as their opponents of the passion; but of a commemoration of the last supper of which Jesus partook with his disciples there is not a hint. Theodoret, in his very brief article on the quartodecimans, says that they kept "the feast of the passover" on the fourteenth day of the moon, and, having misunderstood the apostolic tradition, did not await the day of the Lord's resurrection but celebrated "the memory of the passion" on whatever day of the week the fourteenth might fall.<sup>91</sup> He might seem here to distinguish the memory of the passion from that of the resurrection, and to ascribe only the former to the quartodecimans. But I do not think this is intended; for it in no way affects the point of his objection, and the one really included the other. He speaks of the quartodeciman celebration as a "feast," which makes it probable that it referred to the joyful as well as the mournful part of the closing scenes of Christ's earthly life; and it was quite as inappropriate to celebrate one as the other on any day of the week indiscriminately. In any case there is no reference to the last supper.

We must turn, however, to such contemporary evidence as we possess. This fully confirms the representations of Eusebius. Polycrates, in his letter, speaks simply of keeping a particular

<sup>90</sup> *H. E.*, III, 23.

<sup>91</sup> *Haeret. fab. comp.*, III, 4.

day, and not only makes no allusion to any difference of meaning attached to the day, but says expressly that in keeping it they transgressed in nothing, but followed "according to the rule of the faith." We have not the words of Victor's decree of excommunication; but from Irenæus' letter of remonstrance we may safely infer that it was based solely upon the difference in the time of observance. Irenæus concedes that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection ought to be celebrated only on the Lord's day, clearly implying that this was the point in dispute. He then informs Victor that this was not the only subject of debate; again, I think, implying that this was the only one of which the Roman bishop had taken notice. What other source of variation, then, does he mention? Not a difference in the character of the celebration, not a difference in the events which were commemorated, but only a variety in the length of the preceding fast. This did not interfere with the communion of the churches, but only confirmed the harmony of the faith. Eusebius gives us only portions of the letter; but the implication clearly is that in like manner the observance of this day rather than that ought not to interrupt communion. He supports this argument by an appeal to history. He says that the Roman bishops from Xystus<sup>92</sup> to Anicetus,<sup>93</sup> though not themselves observing, nevertheless maintained communion with those who did observe;<sup>94</sup> and when Polycarp visited Anicetus, though neither could persuade the other to depart from an ancient custom, the latter permitted the former to celebrate the eucharist in the church. Finally, the only part of the epistle from the bishops of Palestine which Eusebius thinks it necessary to quote contains an assurance that "in Alexandria also they celebrate on the same day as we do," as had been learned by an exchange of letters.

Thus all our evidence combines to show that the whole controversy turned upon the day on which the passover should be celebrated, and here the question lay, not between two consecu-

<sup>92</sup> About 115 A. D.

<sup>93</sup> Died about 166.

<sup>94</sup> *Ἐτήρησαν, μὴ τηροῦντες*, etc., have no object expressed; but it seems evident from the whole scope of the epistle that the fourteenth day must be understood.

tive days of the month, but between a fixed day of the month and a fixed day of the week.

We must now review the arguments which were advanced on each side, so far as the fragments which have come down to us will enable us to do so; for we shall thus gain a clearer insight into the nature of the controversy, and test the modern allegation that the quartodeciman practice was founded on the synoptic chronology, that of the rest of the church on the Johannine.

First of all, appeal was made on both sides to tradition. The Asiatics appealed to the example of Philip of Hierapolis, one of the twelve apostles, John of Ephesus who leaned on the breast of the Lord, and an unbroken succession of bishops;<sup>95</sup> and, according to Irenæus, this appeal was made by Polycarp, when he visited Rome, and found there a different custom from his own.<sup>96</sup> On the other hand, the Roman Anicetus appealed only to the custom of the presbyters who preceded him; and it is remarkable that Irenæus, while agreeing with the Roman custom, traces it back only to the time of Xystus. It is not till a much later period that we hear of a western reliance on the apostles Paul and Peter.<sup>97</sup> Eusebius tells us that the bishops of Palestine, at the time of the controversy with Victor, referred to the tradition which had come down to them from the succession of the apostles. Socrates seems to treat all these traditions as of little value, because none of the combatants could produce a written authority.<sup>98</sup> I think this is almost an unreasonable skepticism in regard to the statements of Irenæus; but however this may be, it seems evident that before the controversy broke out the different customs had become established, and were followed as a matter of course till they were challenged from the outside, and then appeal was made in the first instance to tradition, and only afterwards more elaborate arguments were sought for to justify a practice which had become intertwined with the religious affections of the people.<sup>99</sup>

<sup>95</sup> Letter of Polycrates.

<sup>97</sup> SOCRATES, V, 22. SOZOMEN, VII, xix, 1.

<sup>96</sup> Letter to Victor.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>99</sup> In regard to the Palestinian appeal to the apostles I may venture to suggest that



When arguments were at last resorted to, it is impossible to say in what order they were devised and marshaled; but we may conjecture that recourse would be had in the first instance to the Jewish law. The festival was, by universal consent, the passover; and about the observance of the passover very precise directions were given in the law of Moses. Accordingly, Pseudo-Tertullian tells us that Blastus (a quartodeciman Montanist in Rome) affirmed "that the passover ought not to be kept except in accordance with the law of Moses on the fourteenth of the month."<sup>100</sup> Hippolytus too refers to the quartodecimans' regard for what was written in the law, that he should be cursed who did not keep the commandments;<sup>101</sup> and Epiphanius chides them for making use of the saying in the law, "Cursed is he who shall not keep the passover on the fourteenth day of the month."<sup>102</sup> These precise words are not found in the Old Testament, but they are contained inferentially in the curse against all who did not observe the law.<sup>103</sup>

The reply to this argument was easy: it would carry the quartodecimans a great deal farther than they were willing to go. They would be cursed if they were not circumcised, if they did not pay tithes, if they did not bring offerings to Jerusalem.<sup>104</sup> As the apostle had said, they would be debtors to do the whole law, if they bound themselves to one commandment. The true passover had come, and was no longer to be kept in the letter.<sup>105</sup> The Jewish ceremonies were only a shadow of things to come, and now that Judaism had been changed into Christianity, the literal and typical rites of the Mosaic law had ceased. It was not the purpose of the Saviour or his apostles to legislate about feast days, but to introduce an upright life and

the apostles were not very likely to adopt the somewhat complicated Roman mode of reckoning Easter, or to depart from the Jewish day of celebrating the passover; but having kept the passover at the usual time in memory of the passion, they may have observed the following Sunday with peculiar solemnity in memory of the resurrection. Thus a starting point would have been supplied for divergent practices.

<sup>100</sup> *Adv. omn. haer.*, § 8.

<sup>101</sup> *Ref.*, VIII, 18.

<sup>102</sup> *Haer.*, L, 1.

<sup>103</sup> See also the account of Sabbatius in SOCRATES, VII, 5.

<sup>104</sup> EPIPH., *ibid.*, 2.

<sup>105</sup> HIP., *ibid.*

piety.<sup>106</sup> And if the quartodecimans thought that they ought to follow the Jewish practice because Christ did so, then they ought to do everything else which he did in a Jewish fashion.<sup>107</sup> We must not, however, conclude from this mode of reply that the opponents of the quartodecimans had detached their feast from the passover, and become indifferent to the ancient law, but only that they were willing to interpret it with a certain latitude of meaning. As the writer of the Paschal Chronicle says, the typical passover came to an end through the death and resurrection of Christ, the true passover; and in memory of this event the church of God kept the holy feast every year, "observing without error the fourteenth day of the first lunar month, in which the legal passover has been ordered to be celebrated, after the advent of the day in which the Holy Spirit taught that the spring equinox begins;" and if this happened to be Sunday or any succeeding day of the week the feast of the resurrection was kept on the following Sunday.<sup>108</sup> Thus the fourteenth day of the month, that is to say, the full moon at or after the vernal equinox, was carefully noted by the westerns as the indispensable basis of their calculations, and they thus showed their regard for the law, although they departed from its letter. This account is substantially confirmed by Eusebius some centuries earlier. In his treatise on the passover he gives a brief description of its original institution, as the source of the Christian observance, of which it was typical;<sup>109</sup> and in none of the replies to the quartodeciman argument is it maintained that the Christian feast was not the passover, and was in no way dependent on the ancient commandment.

Why, then, it may be asked, was not the fourteenth day universally observed? For if the day was a matter of indifference, it would have been most natural to adhere to the established custom. The change was partly owing to contempt for the

<sup>106</sup> EUSEB. in MAI, § 1; SOCR., V, 22 near beginning. See also a "Discourse on the Resurrection of Christ," attributed to Epiphanius (in MIGNE, column 468 f.), and APHRAATES, *Hom.*, xii, 4.

<sup>107</sup> SOCR., *ibid.* See also *Chron. Pasch.*, pp. 12, 16.

<sup>108</sup> Pp. 15 f., 18 f.

<sup>109</sup> MAI, §§ 1 and 6-7. See also EPIPH., *Haer.*, L, 2, and APHRAATES, *Hom.*, xii, §§ 1-4.

Jews, and a wish to be dissociated from them as much as possible,—a state of mind which finds strong expression in the letter of Constantine. I can hardly suppose, however, that this was really operative in the first instance, and much better reasons existed. Among the Jews, it is alleged, certain irregularities had arisen. In order to bring the lunar year into agreement with the solar it was necessary periodically to intercalate a month. In consequence of this the determination of the equinox was sometimes neglected, so that, when the year was reckoned from one vernal equinox to another, the Jews sometimes celebrated two passovers in one year, and none in the next. To keep the passover in this way before the equinox was a violation of the law; and it was contended that, though the Jews in ancient times had observed the correct time for the feast, they had ceased to do so from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem under Vespasian; or, according to another opinion, from the date of the crucifixion. There was, therefore, a real reason for refusing to follow the Jews in their time of celebration, even on the part of those who considered themselves bound by the commandment; and Socrates tells us that this led to a division among the quartodecimans themselves, some thinking that they ought to follow the Jews, whilst others maintained that the passover ought always to come after the equinox in the Roman month of April.<sup>110</sup> Here, then, was the first cause of divergence, the quartodecimans for the most part adhering to the Jewish determination of the season; the westerns, who were accustomed to the solar year, universally celebrating the feast after the equinox.

This cause of divergence, however, is not mentioned in the earliest accounts, and it does not explain why the westerns departed from the fourteenth day. The reason for this may be gathered from the nature of the Christian festival, and is clearly

<sup>110</sup> V, 22. On the general subject see the same chapter; SOZOMEN, VII, xviii, 7; EUSEB., edited by MAI, § 12; Constantine's letter; EPIPH., *Haer.*, L, 3 (the words should be noted: *παρτηρούμεθα μὲν τὴν τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτην, ὑπερβαίνομεν δὲ τὴν ἰσημερίαν, φέρομεν δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγίαν κυριακὴν τὸ τέλος τῆς συμπληρώσεως λαμβάνομεν δὲ τὸ πρόβατον ἀπὸ δεκάτης*), LXX, 11; Peter of Alex. in *Chron. Pasch.*, pp. 4 ff.; Dionysius of Alex. in EUSEB., *H. E.*, VII, 20; *Constit. Apost.*, V, 17.

stated by Epiphanius.<sup>111</sup> Regard was paid to three measures of time, the solar year, the month, and the week. The first decided the equinox, after which the festival must be held. The second fixed the fourteenth day, on which, under the law, the sheep was to be killed, and on which, accordingly, Christ was crucified. But a week was observed instead of a single day, partly because the sheep was set apart from the tenth day to the fourteenth, and partly because the events connected with the true paschal Lamb were not limited to a single day, but comprised the resurrection, which took place two days after the passion. The fourteenth day, therefore, was comprised within the week; but the breaking of the fast, and the celebration of the festival, were postponed till the Lord's day. If, however, the fourteenth fell on a Sunday, the feast was put off till the next Sunday. I cannot suppose that this was due merely to a wish to differ from the Jews;<sup>112</sup> but it seemed only natural to dedicate the fourteenth to the memory of the passion, and therefore to include it within the period of the fast. There was also a further reason for postponement in the fact that the resurrection took place subsequently to the fourteenth.<sup>113</sup> The writer of the Paschal Chronicle says that the postponement was made for two reasons: first, it would have been contrary to law to terminate the fast on the thirteenth, before the moon was actually full; and, secondly, it would have been unbecoming to carry on the fast into the Lord's day. It was therefore necessary to put off the celebration; but then, as the number ten includes the number nine, so the later date includes the earlier.<sup>114</sup> There is nothing in this explanation inconsistent with our oldest authorities, and it enables us to see how easily the conflicting usages arose. The Jewish festival passed into the Christian church, and was kept in memory of the death and resurrection of Christ, the great redemptive work which was symbolized by the ancient deliverance from Egypt. Nothing could be more natural than the Asiatic adherence to the time prescribed by the law; and, on the other hand, as the

<sup>111</sup> *Haer.*, L, 3; LXX, 11-12.

<sup>112</sup> *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 424. For the dislike of the Jews see also Constantine's letter.

<sup>113</sup> See *Chron. Pasch.*, pp. 413 ff., 30 ff.

<sup>114</sup> P. 30.

church became more and more Gentile, it was equally natural to modify the time in accordance with Christian memories, and keep the festival of the resurrection only on the Lord's day. The propriety of the latter observance constituted, as we have seen, the stress of the argument in the first instance.

So far the arguments on each side have little or no bearing on the gospel question ; but we come now to an allegation which, if it could be substantiated, would lend some support to the opponents of the Johannine authorship. It is that the quartodecimans relied on the synoptic chronology, and rejected the Johannine, whereas the westerns adhered to the latter, and set aside the former. This contention appears to me to be founded on an entire misconception of the controversy, and not to be supported by the facts. In order that the argument might be valid, the dispute ought to have been whether the Christian passover was to be kept on the thirteenth or the fourteenth day of the month. Of such a dispute there is not a trace. The westerns, as we have seen, were as particular about observing the fourteenth of the month as the quartodecimans themselves ; only, instead of holding the feast on that day, they calculated from it the Sunday on which the celebration should be kept. The controversy, therefore, was not between adjoining days of the month, but between the day of the month and the day of the week, and consequently was in no way connected with the varying chronology of the gospels. This being the case, it is not surprising that no allusion to different opinions about the gospels occurs in the histories of the controversy, and among the arguments contained in any connected treatise against the quartodecimans there is no appeal to the fourth gospel. This fact would be unintelligible if the westerns had really supposed that the gospel of John settled the question. It may be asked, then, What support is there for the modern allegation ? It rests on a few arguments which have come down to us in complete isolation from their context ; and as they relate to the date of the last supper, it has been assumed that they are parts of the quartodeciman controversy. We must examine these, as well as some other statements on the same subject, and I believe we shall find

that the difference of opinion about the evangelical chronology did not coincide with the separation between western and quartodeciman, but that defenders of both views were to be found on both sides, and that instead of admitting a discrepancy between the synoptics and John they had, with hardly an exception, some way of forcing the gospels to speak with one voice.

Before we proceed to the fragments themselves, we must notice the opinions of a few well-known writers, that we may have at least a small body of assured fact on which to base our judgment of a more obscure question. Turning first to Irenæus, we find a chapter in which he is specially defending the Johannean chronology against the opinion of the Valentinians, represented by Ptolemæus, that the ministry of Jesus lasted only for one year. He refutes this opinion by pointing out the number of passovers which, according to John, the disciple of the Lord, Jesus had celebrated, and he assumes without remark that finally Christ went up to Jerusalem, ate the passover, and suffered on the following day.<sup>115</sup> Here, then, while appealing to the fourth gospel, he tacitly assumes that in regard to the Last Supper and the crucifixion it is in agreement with the synoptics. This testimony is important because, as we know, Irenæus thought the quartodecimans mistaken, and therefore, according to the hypothesis we are considering, he ought to have believed that Jesus partook of the last supper on the thirteenth, and was crucified on the day of the passover; yet he gives not a hint that any difference of opinion on this question existed. It further deserves remark that, in connection with his whole argument, he appeals to "all the elders who in Asia had intercourse with John the disciple of the Lord."<sup>116</sup> This surely proves that it was possible for Asiatics at once to acknowledge the authority of the fourth gospel, and yet to believe that Jesus was crucified the day after the passover. We should observe also that Irenæus wrote a treatise on the passover,<sup>117</sup> and was, therefore, in all probability quite familiar with the arguments current in his own day.

<sup>115</sup> II, xxii, 3.

<sup>116</sup> § 5.

<sup>117</sup> See Fragment VII in STIEREN's edition.

Origen, also, in commenting on Matthew 26: 17,<sup>118</sup> follows the synoptical account, and this without any allusion to a different date in John, although he was keenly observant of differences between the gospels. This is the more remarkable because he thinks it well to meet an argument which was founded on the synoptical record. Owing to the fact, he says, that Jesus celebrated the passover corporeally in the Jewish fashion some of the inexperienced may fall into ebionism, and maintain that we, as imitators of Christ, ought to do likewise. To this he replies that Jesus was made under the law, not in order that he might leave under the law those who were under it, but that he might lead them out of it. It was, therefore, unbecoming in those who had been previously outside the law to enter into it. Accordingly Christians came out from the letter of the law, and through a spiritual celebration fulfilled all things which were there commanded to be celebrated corporeally. They cast out the old leaven of malice and iniquity, and kept the passover with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, Christ feasting along with them according to the will of the Lamb who said, "Unless ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye will not have life abiding in you." Here, then, we find the fourth gospel referred to, and Jesus represented as the paschal Lamb, and yet not a hint of any error in the usual interpretation of the synoptic chronology. We must further observe that there is no allusion to the peculiarity of the quartodecimans. The question turns, not on the day of observance, but on the manner of observance. The people who are corrected fall into ebionism, a reproach which was not brought against the quartodecimans; for though they were thought to resemble the Jews too closely in one particular, they were recognized as orthodox, and, as Eusebius says, when they gave way on the one question of the day of observance, they withdrew from the slayers of the Lord, and joined their fellow-believers, for nature draws like to like.<sup>119</sup> And again, one of the objections against the quartodecimans was that, although they followed the Jewish reckoning, they did not carry

<sup>118</sup> In *Matt. commentariorum series*, § 79, pp. 405 ff. (Lom.).

<sup>119</sup> In *MAI*, § 8.

out the legal prescriptions with sufficient care; for they confined their celebration to a single day, whereas they ought to have chosen the sheep on the tenth day, and so fasted for five days, thus conforming to the general practice of the church in celebrating a whole week.<sup>120</sup> We learn, then, from Origen's remarks, what we have already learned from the letter of Irenæus, that the controversy about Easter was not limited to the quartodeciman peculiarity. So important a division within the bosom of the catholic church brought the whole subject into prominence, and afforded an opportunity for broaching every kind of view. The legal requirements, the relation of the law to Christianity, the ceremonies to be observed, the narratives of the gospels, the year of the crucifixion, and the days of the last supper and the death of Jesus, all came under discussion.<sup>121</sup> We are not, therefore, warranted in assuming that there were only two compact parties, and that every argument and allusion must refer to the single point by which they were divided from one another. At one extreme were the men corrected by Origen, who thought they must adhere to the letter of the law. These were in all probability quartodecimans, though we are not told so; but it does not follow that they were representatives of the orthodox churches of Asia Minor. At the other extreme we are told of one Aërius, a contemporary of Epiphanius, who maintained that Christians generally were clinging to Jewish fables, and ought not to observe the passover, "for Christ our passover was sacrificed."<sup>122</sup> This view would fall in with the gnostic tendencies of the second century, but I have not observed any allusion to it at that period. Between these extremes came the catholic church, with its agreement about the general principles, and its internal division about the day of celebration

<sup>120</sup> EPIPH., *Haer.*, L, 1, 3; LXX, 12.

<sup>121</sup> For the fullest examples of treatises on the passover see EUSEB. in MAI and the *Hom.* of APHRAATES. I may refer also to the treatise of Irenæus, for we are told that he spoke in it of the practice of not bending the knee, and mentioned the feast of pentecost, from which we may conclude that, though his work was probably called forth by the quartodeciman controversy, it was not limited to the particular point in dispute. See STIEREN, Fragment VII.

<sup>122</sup> EPIPH., *Haer.*, LXXV, 3.



These varieties must be borne in mind in our subsequent investigations.

The opinion of Eusebius, which is fully explained in his treatise,<sup>123</sup> is particularly interesting and important, because it is given in connection with the quartodeciman controversy, and his statement is clearly a reply to a quartodeciman argument; and nevertheless he adheres to the synoptical chronology. The following is his mode of reasoning: "But if anyone<sup>124</sup> should say that it has been written that on the first day of unleavened bread the disciples came and said to the Saviour, Where wilt thou that we make ready for thee to eat the passover? and he sent them to such a one, having enjoined upon them to say, With thee I keep the passover, we will say that this is not a commandment, but a history of an event that happened at the season of the saving passion; but to relate an ancient practice is one thing, and it is another to legislate and leave injunctions for the future. But, further, the Saviour did not keep the passover with the Jews at the time of his own passion; for he did not himself celebrate his own passover with his disciples at the time when *they* [the Jews] killed the lamb; for they did this on the day of preparation<sup>125</sup> on which the Saviour suffered; whence neither did they enter into the prætorium, but Pilate comes out to them; but he himself, a whole day before, on the fifth day of the week,<sup>126</sup> reclined with the disciples, and eating with them, said to them, With desire I desired to eat this passover with you. Dost thou see how the Saviour did not eat the passover with the Jews?" Since the practice was new he desired it, but the old customs were not desirable, "but the new mystery of his new covenant, which accordingly he communicated to his own disciples, was, as we might expect, desirable to him, since many prophets and righteous men before him desired to see the mysteries of the new covenant." The passover of Moses was not suited to all nations, as it had to be celebrated in Jerusalem; wherefore it was not desirable. But the saving mystery of the new covenant was suitable to all men, and naturally was desirable to him.

<sup>123</sup> In MAI, §§ 8-12.

<sup>124</sup> No doubt, from the connection, a quartodeciman.

<sup>125</sup> That is, Friday.

<sup>126</sup> Thursday.

After he had had the feast the chief priests laid hands upon him, for they did not eat the passover in the evening ; for otherwise they would not have had time to interfere with him. They took him to Caiaphas, and then to Pilate, and then the Scripture says that they did not enter the prætorium that they might not be defiled. But on that very day of the passion they ate the passover, demanding the saving blood, not on behalf of themselves, but against themselves. " But our Saviour kept his own desirable festival, not then, but a day before, reclining with the disciples." From that time Christ withdrew from the Jews and attached himself to his disciples. " Therefore we also ought to eat the passover with Christ," removing from our mind all the leaven of wickedness, and filled with the unleavened bread of truth and sincerity, having the true circumcision, and anointing the posts of our mind with the blood of the Sheep sacrificed for us ; and this not at one period of the whole year, but every week ; and let our preparation be " a fast, a symbol of sorrow, on account of our former sins, and in memory of the saving passion." The Jews fell from the truth from the time when they plotted against the Truth itself, driving from them the Word of Life ; " and this the scripture of the sacred gospels presents clearly ; for it testifies that the Lord ate the passover on the first day of unleavened bread ; and, as Luke says, they did not eat their customary passover on the day on which the passover ought to have been killed, but on the following day, which was the second day of unleavened bread, and the fifteenth of the moon, in which, our Saviour being judged by Pilate, they did not enter the prætorium ; and therefore they did not eat it according to the law on the first day of unleavened bread, when it ought to have been killed ; for they themselves, too, would have kept the passover with the Saviour ; but from that time, together with their plot against our Saviour, blinded by their own wickedness, they fell from all truth. But we celebrate the same mysteries through the whole year," fasting every Friday in memory of the saving passion, and every Lord's day quickened by the sanctified body of the same saving passover, and sealing our souls with his precious blood.

It was necessary to quote this passage at length, not only on account of its intrinsic interest, but because its position is completely misunderstood even by so careful a student as Schürer.<sup>127</sup> He declares that Eusebius replies to the quartodeciman argument that Christ really ate his own passover on the thirteenth. There may be some little obscurity in the former part of the argument, which is all that Schürer quotes; but the concluding section is perfectly explicit, and clears up whatever might have been doubtful in the previous exposition. It will be useful to analyze the several thoughts.

First, let us observe the nature of the quartodeciman argument. It is not that the annual festival was a commemoration of the last supper, and that therefore it ought to be kept on the same day as the meal it was designed to bring to memory. It is that Jesus himself observed the passover, and observed it correctly, on the fourteenth day of the month, and that therefore his disciples ought to do the same, instead of keeping their passover on a day of the month which Jesus had never sanctioned. To this argument Eusebius makes two replies: First, he urges that though it was quite true that Jesus had kept the passover at the time alleged, an historical record did not constitute a commandment: in other words, the mere fact that Jesus celebrated his passover on a particular day did not create a binding rule for his disciples. Secondly, although he adhered to the legal day, nevertheless he did not eat his passover with the Jews; for they postponed their observance till the next day, the second day of unleavened bread, and the fifteenth of the month, and so fell away from the truth. To appreciate the force of this argument we must remember that one of the reproaches against the quartodecimans was that they kept the feast at the same time as the Jews, and one of the objections made to this practice was that the Jews had got wrong in their calculations, and that therefore Christians ought not to follow them. Here Eusebius dates their error from the year of the passion, and shows that Jesus kept a passover of his own, apart from the Jews. This is proved first by the words recorded in Luke:<sup>128</sup>

<sup>127</sup> *De cont. pasch.*, § V, 3.

<sup>128</sup> 22 : 15.

"With desire I desired to eat this passover with you." "*This passover*" was not the ordinary one, but that in which the mystery of the new covenant was instituted. It was only as new that it could be desired; for an old practice, which comes as a matter of course, is not an object of desire. And, further, Jesus desired to eat "with you," with his disciples, and not with the Jews. Thus he separated himself from the Jews in the meaning which he attached to the festival. But, secondly, he did so in regard to time likewise; for they kept the passover on the wrong day. This appears from the fact that they had time to carry out their plot against Jesus, from their inability to enter the prætorium, and from Luke's statement that the day of unleavened bread was the day when the passover ought to have been killed,<sup>129</sup> implying that it was not killed at the proper time. Thus it appears that Eusebius accepted the chronology of the synoptic gospels, and brought the Johannine account into agreement with it by pushing on the Jewish celebration of the passover from the fourteenth to the fifteenth day of the month.

The same view was taken by Chrysostom. He says: "The sanhedrin passed the night in watching for the accomplishment of their foul purpose: for they did not even at that time eat the passover, as St. John says. What are we to say? Why, that they ate it on another day, and brake the law. Christ would not have violated the proper time, but these men violated it, who were trampling on ten thousand laws. Boiling over, as they were, with rage, and having often attempted to slay him, and been unable, now that they had gotten him in their power, they chose even to give up the passover the more surely to glut their murderous appetite."<sup>130</sup>

Epiphanius, when controverting the opinions of Marcion, though he does not refer to the question of dates, sides with the synoptics by insisting that Jesus must have eaten flesh, because he kept the passover which is according to law, or according to

<sup>129</sup> Luke 22:7.

<sup>130</sup> In *Matth.*, *Hom. 84*: quoted by McCLELLAN, *Four Gospels*, p. 487 f. (a few words are omitted, but the sense is given). In *Hom. 81* he says, "But why did he keep the passover? Showing by all means, up to the last day, that he is not opposed to the law."

the Jews; and Marcion, he says, cannot escape from this argument by pretending that when Jesus said he wished to eat the passover he referred to the mystery which he was about to institute, for it is expressly stated that he instituted the mystery "after he had supped."<sup>131</sup> Epiphanius in this passage of course wishes to base his argument entirely on the parts of Luke which were accepted by Marcion; but he could not have honestly reasoned as he does unless he believed that the last supper was a real passover meal celebrated in conformity with the Jewish law. Nevertheless in his article on the quartodecimans he says: "It behoved Christ to be sacrificed on the fourteenth day according to the law."<sup>132</sup> Here, then, it might be thought, he follows the Johannine account, and is induced to do so through his opposition to the quartodecimans. This, however, is not the case. In his article on the *Alogi* he clears up the difficulty in a passage which, though a little obscure in some of its details, is plain enough in its general meaning. He is there dealing with the objection, not that the last supper was differently placed, but that there were more passovers in the fourth gospel than in the others; and he maintains that the Jews kept the passover before the right time, so that Jesus, although he ate "the Jewish passover" with his disciples in order that he might not destroy the law, but fulfill it, was crucified on the fourteenth day of the month, and rose on the sixteenth, which in that year was the equinox. It was on the sixteenth that the sheaf was presented at the annual festival, and thus it prefigured the resurrection of him who was the first-fruits of the dead. This anticipation of the proper time for the passover was due to the nature of the lunar month, which necessitated the periodical intercalation of days and months to keep the calendar approximately correct.<sup>133</sup> Thus Epiphanius brings the sacrifice of the true paschal Lamb to the proper day of the month, not by availing himself of the apparent Johannine chronology, but by assuming that the Jews had got a day in advance; and we may fairly assume that he saw no discordance between John and the

<sup>131</sup> Luke 22 : 20. See *Haer.*, XLII, Refut. of Schol. 61 from Marcion's Gospel.

<sup>132</sup> L, 2.

<sup>133</sup> LI, 26, 27, 31.

synoptics. The quartodecimans are refuted on quite other grounds.

A fragment of a chronicle wrongly ascribed to Eusebius, but probably proceeding from one Severus, also maintains the synoptic dates, although it accepts the Johannine view of the length of the ministry. The writer says that three years elapsed between the baptism and the crucifixion, and that our Lord ate the shadowy passover with his disciples, and introduced the authentic one, on the fifth day of the week, which was the fourteenth of the moon, and the twenty-second of March; that on the night between that and the twenty-third he was betrayed, and having been crucified rose again on the twenty-fifth. No notice is taken of any apparent inconsistency between the gospels.<sup>134</sup>

Aphraates likewise assumes that "our Redeemer ate the passover with his disciples on the usual night of the fourteenth."<sup>135</sup> Nevertheless the Christian passover was distinguished from the Jewish by the fact that the latter was kept on the fourteenth of Nisan, whereas the Christian "day of the great passion is the Friday, the fifteenth of Nisan," that being the day on which believers were redeemed from the service of Satan, as the Israelites had been from subjection to Pharaoh.<sup>136</sup> It appears, then, that in the far East the passover always began on the same day of the month, unless indeed that happened to be a Sunday, when the celebration was postponed till Monday;<sup>137</sup> and so far there was an agreement with the quartodecimans. But the day was the fifteenth, and not the fourteenth, and this day was fixed by the synoptic chronology. The whole week, however, was celebrated, in accordance with the law which prescribed the feast of unleavened bread, and the great feast day was the Friday.<sup>138</sup> Here there is an approach to the western custom of giving the preference to the day of the week. We ought further to observe that Aphraates does not connect the feast in any way with the resurrection. In this statement, then, we have not only another illustration of the various ways in which the

<sup>134</sup> See the Fragment in DINDORF'S *Chron. Pasch.*, II, p. 112.

<sup>135</sup> *Hom.* xii, 4.

<sup>136</sup> § 6.

<sup>137</sup> § 8.

<sup>138</sup> §§ 6 and 8.

passover was regarded, but a valuable light upon the kind of argument which a quartodeciman might use. If the latter reasoned in the same way as Aphraates he could defend the observance of the fourteenth only by an appeal to the fourth gospel. We shall see that an Asiatic bishop, Apollinaris, did appeal to the fourth gospel to prove that the crucifixion took place on the fourteenth, and that he was, in all probability, a quartodeciman.

It is therefore abundantly proved that there were writers on the anti-quartodeciman side who accepted the synoptic account in its plain meaning. Before proceeding to writers who, in dealing with the eastern question, defend the Johannine view as it is now generally understood, we must notice two other testimonies which are given independently of that problem, one being doubtful, and the other opposed to the view which we have thus far presented. Justin Martyr says, "Christ was the passover who was sacrificed afterwards,"<sup>139</sup> as also Isaiah said, He was brought as a sheep to the slaughter. And it has been written that on the day of the passover you seized him, and similarly in the passover crucified him."<sup>140</sup> I think Justin might have used these words whichever view he adopted. If he referred to the fourth gospel, then he not only knew it, but accepted it as an authoritative document. On the whole, however, it seems more likely that he followed the synoptics, and, if so, then it is clear that in the middle of the second century the belief that Christ was crucified on the fifteenth of the month did not interfere with the conviction that he was the true paschal Lamb.

Tertullian, having stated that Moses predicted the sacrifice of the Lamb by the people of Israel, proceeds: "He added that it is 'the passover of the Lord;'<sup>141</sup> that is, the passion of Christ. And this, also, has been so fulfilled that on the first day of unleavened bread you put Christ to death."<sup>142</sup> The day on which the lamb was killed is called "the first day of unleavened bread" in Matt. 26: 17; and that this is the day which Tertullian meant is expressly stated in an earlier passage, in which he says

<sup>139</sup> He has just referred to the original passover in Egypt.

<sup>140</sup> *Dial.*, 111.

<sup>141</sup> Ex. 12: 11.

<sup>142</sup> *Adv. Jud.*, 10.

that the passion was completed "on the first day of unleavened bread, in which they killed the lamb towards evening."<sup>143</sup> The curious thing about this statement is that Tertullian quotes the words of Matthew which distinctly refer to the day before the passion, and follows the synoptics in assigning only one year to the ministry, saying that Christ was about thirty when he suffered.<sup>144</sup> In what way he harmonized these views does not appear.

We come now to the fragments preserved in the Paschal Chronicle which have played such a conspicuous part in the inquiry into the nature of the quartodeciman controversy, and to assist our judgment of the meaning and value of these fragments it will be advantageous to summarize the arguments which we have found in treatises, of which the complete context is before us, and several of which expressly relate to the question about which the catholic church was so seriously divided. The question was whether Christians ought to keep the passover at the same time as the Jews, on the fourteenth of Nisan, whatever day of the week that might be, or only on Sunday, the Sunday being that which followed the first full moon after the vernal equinox. In favor of the western practice it was urged that it was supported by apostolic tradition; that the feast of the resurrection ought not to be kept before Sunday; that the law, being only typical, was not to be kept in the letter; that the record that Jesus kept the passover on the fourteenth did not constitute a commandment; that he himself was under the law in order to bring men out from under the law;<sup>145</sup> that the quartodecimans, though so strict about the day, did not keep the law properly; that the Jews had got wrong in their calculations, so that their passover was sometimes before the equinox; that Jesus did not eat the last passover with the Jews, because the Jews broke the law, and postponed their celebration; and, finally, that Christians ought not to have any part with traitorous Jews. It appears, therefore, that from existing

<sup>143</sup> § 8.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>145</sup> This may be included, as appropriate, though actually said in relation to another point.



works we gain a pretty complete picture of the controversy, and yet we have not found a vestige of an appeal to the peculiar view of the fourth gospel. Nay, we have found that Irenæus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius, who wrote against the quartodeciman practice, adhered to the synoptic account of the last supper, as also did Origen, Chrysostom, and probably Justin. The conclusion is inevitable that the appeal to the fourth gospel was not a salient argument; that those who make it are expressing an individual opinion, and not the opinion of a party; and that their object is not to exalt the thirteenth above the fourteenth of the month, which had nothing to do with the question, but to show that Christ, in the last meal, when the new covenant was instituted, was not associated with the Jews. We have seen that some writers on the western side do not deny or object to Christ's recorded association with the Jews, while others get rid of it, not through an alleged anticipation of the passover by Jesus, but through a postponement of it by the Jews. Bearing all this in mind, we turn to the Paschal Chronicle.

We must notice first the author's own statements. His object, we must remember, is simply chronological, and he does not quote his authorities for the purpose of refuting the quartodecimans, but in order to confirm his own system of calculation. He has to determine the correct paschal cycle, and to ascertain the precise date of Christ's death in order that he may reckon the first Christian cycle from that definite point. Now there were two sources of uncertainty: (1) The Jews may in the year of the crucifixion have kept the passover in the wrong month; and (2) it was not agreed whether the passion took place on the fourteenth or on the fifteenth day. His first object, therefore, is to show that the Jews kept the passover correctly until the destruction of Jerusalem under Vespasian, and for this purpose he quotes Philo, Peter of Alexandria, and Athanasius.<sup>146</sup> Thus it was proved that the passover at which Christ suffered was held at the proper

<sup>146</sup> Pp. 3-10. It has been supposed that Athanasius refers in this extract to the quartodecimans. He speaks of "contentious persons, who have invented for themselves questions, under the pretext indeed of the saving passover, but in reality for the sake of their own strife, because seeming to be of us, and boasting to be called Christians, they emulate the acts of the traitor Jews." "For," he continues, "what sort of even

time. The next question is: Was the moon full on Thursday or Friday? The crucifixion took place on Friday. We learn from the evangelist John that Jesus as the True Lamb suffered at the feast of the passover, that is, on the fourteenth day of the month.<sup>147</sup> Accordingly the problem was to find the year, within certain obvious limits, in which the first full moon after the vernal equinox fell upon a Friday. In order to establish his thesis that Christ was crucified on the very day on which the Jews were to eat the passover, he appeals first to the familiar texts in the fourth gospel; and to guarantee the correctness of the reading he refers to "the accurate books, and the very autograph of the evangelist, which has been kept till now by the grace of God, in the most holy Church of the Ephesians, and is there worshiped by the faithful."<sup>148</sup> Next he adduces the testimony of Paul, "'Christ our passover was sacrificed for us,' and not as some, carried away by ignorance, affirm that he was betrayed when he had eaten the passover; which neither have we learned from the holy gospels, nor has any of the blessed apostles handed down to us anything of the kind." On this statement we must remark that the synoptic gospels are represented as agreeing with the Johannine, that there is no mention of quartodecimans, and that among the men "carried away by ignorance" we have found several of the most learned theologians on the anti-quartodeciman side. Our author, it is true, assumes that the fathers are in agreement with him, and out of "much testimony of the holy fathers of the church" proceeds to quote, as a "few"

plausible defense could be made for them since it has been written, 'On the first day of unleavened bread,' and 'In which they ought to kill the passover.' But it was done properly at that time, but now, according to what has been written, they do always err in their heart." I hesitate about making use of this fragment, because even if Athanasius is attacking the remains of quartodecimanism, which held out against the decision of the Nicene Council, it does not follow that his argument would be applicable to the orthodox quartodecimans of an earlier time. Still it deserves notice that his conclusive argument is an appeal to the synoptics, and that the only thing that this appeal can refute is the opinion that not the last supper but the crucifixion itself took place on the day of the passover. We have here some indication that the quartodecimans of the fourth century relied upon the chronology of the fourth gospel to justify their practice.

<sup>147</sup> P. 10 f.

<sup>148</sup> P. 11. The same words are used in relation to the same text on p. 411.

samples, passages from Hippolytus, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and Clement of Alexandria. These writers, therefore, are not cited in connection with the quartodeciman controversy, and their relation to it can be learned only from their historical position, and from the evidence afforded by the extracts themselves. In a later portion of the work our author adduces an argument from the synoptic gospels. It is clear, he says, that Jesus did not keep the passover on the fourteenth, but celebrated the typical supper before this, when the sanctification of the unleavened bread and the preparation of the feast took place, for he did not give his disciples the sacrificial lamb and unleavened bread, but bread and a cup.<sup>149</sup>

We will now take the extracts in their order. The first is from the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus against all heresies, and is as follows: "I see, then, that the affair is one of contentiousness; for he says thus: 'Christ kept the passover at that time on the day, and suffered; wherefore I ought also to do in the same manner as the Lord did.' But he has been led astray, not knowing that at the time in which Christ suffered he did not eat the legal passover; for he was the passover which had been preached beforehand, and was made perfect on the appointed day." The person who is here attacked was in all probability a quartodeciman, and may have been Blastus, who is mentioned as such by Pseudo-Tertullian,—*Against all Heresies*.<sup>150</sup> When the Asiatic custom was challenged, and it became necessary to seek for arguments to defend it, nothing could be more natural than to turn to the gospels, and show that Christ himself had kept the passover on the day appointed by the law. This was allowed by some of the ablest of their opponents, and we have seen that there were different ways of getting out of the argument, the genuineness and authority of the fourth gospel being admitted all the time. Hippolytus, departing from the opinion of his master Irenæus, disposes of the difficulty by denying the fact. It deserves remark that in his later work, the *Refutatio*, while he still thinks the quartodecimans contentious; he does not refer to this argument. Had he discovered that, though it was put

<sup>149</sup> P. 409 f.

<sup>150</sup> § 8.

forward by Blastus, it was not commonly used by the Christians of Asia Minor?

The second extract is taken from the first book of Hippolytus' work on the passover: "That he did not speak falsely either in the first or in the last is evident, because he who long ago predicted, 'I will no more eat the passover,'<sup>151</sup> assuredly took the supper before the passover, and did not eat the passover, but suffered; for not even was it the time for eating it." The interest of this passage is that it gives us one more glimpse into the way in which the synoptics were harmonized with John, and proves that Hippolytus, at all events, had no intention of pitting one gospel against the rest.

We may notice next the two extracts from the work of Clement of Alexandria on the passover, as they do not give rise to any controversy. He says that in former years Christ kept the regular passover, but ceased to do so when he proclaimed himself as the paschal Lamb. Accordingly he suffered on the fourteenth, and the chief priests and scribes did not enter the prætorium, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover without hindrance in the evening. "With this exactitude of the days both all the Scriptures agree and the gospels are in harmony. The resurrection also testifies to it; at least he rose on the third day, which was the first of the weeks of the harvest, in which it had been enacted that the priest should offer the sheaf." These passages call for only one or two remarks. We have seen that treatises on the passover embraced a variety of subjects, and necessarily included the question of the day, which involved the year, of Christ's death; so that there is nothing here which can even suggest that Clement is arguing against the quartodecimans. Again, although he appeals to the verse in John, without which the case would be weak in the extreme, he nevertheless assumes that all the gospels are in agreement.

We are now prepared to criticise the fragments of Apollinaris' work on the passover. He says: "There are, then, persons who, owing to ignorance, are contentious about these things,

<sup>151</sup> See Luke 22:16.

being affected in a pardonable way; for ignorance does not admit of accusation, but requires instruction. And they say that on the fourteenth the Lord ate the sheep with the disciples, but himself suffered on the great day of unleavened bread, and they relate that Matthew speaks in accordance with their opinion. Hence both their opinion is inconsistent with the law, and the gospels seem, according to them, to be at variance." The next extract from the same treatise is a rhetorical glorification of the fourteenth day of the month. "The fourteenth day," he says, "is the genuine passover of the Lord, the great sacrifice; the child of God instead of the lamb; the bound one, he who bound the strong man; and he who was judge, the judge of the living and the dead; and the one who was betrayed into the hands of sinners to be crucified, he who was exalted on the horns of the unicorn; and the one who had his holy side pierced, he who poured forth out of his side the two purifiers, water and blood, word and spirit, and was buried in the day of the passover, the stone being laid upon the tomb." The value of these extracts, in their bearing on the authorship of the fourth gospel, is supposed to consist in this, that Apollinaris is attacking the quartodecimans, and alleges against them the date of the crucifixion which is found in the Johannine gospel, whereas they rely upon Matthew in their defense of a custom which they inherited from the apostle John. The inference is inevitable that they cannot have regarded as Johannine the gospel which they controverted on the authority of Matthew. This argument appears to me to rest on a complete misconception.

First, let us suppose that Apollinaris was not a quartodeciman. It does not at all follow that he is attacking quartodecimans; for he makes no allusion to the quartodeciman practice. The discussion of the date of the last supper necessarily entered into the question of Easter, and we have not hitherto met with any evidence of the prevailing quartodeciman opinion on this point. We have learned from Hippolytus that one quartodeciman believed that Jesus ate the legal passover at the time of the passion; but other quartodecimans may have taken a different view. Accordingly, Apollinaris may be attacking the observers of the western

custom, like Irenæus. The simple fact is that the opinion which Apollinaris advocates seems to have been taken up with some eagerness about the end of the second century, being supported also by Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, and Tertullian. In later time it was defended by the unknown author of the Paschal Chronicle. But, in spite of the charge of ignorance, it was rejected by Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and, I believe, by the later church generally.<sup>152</sup> The necessary inference is that this particular point did not affect the quartodeciman controversy one way or the other. If the quartodecimans relied, as they might naturally do, on the fact that Jesus ate the legal passover (of course believing, as so many have done since, that the fourth gospel was in harmony with the synoptics), it was a tempting reply that he did not do so, as was proved by the testimony of John. But this reply failed to establish itself, for the evidence of the synoptics was too clear to be resisted; and other means of rebutting the argument had to be tried. As we have observed, even Hippolytus does not venture to repeat it in his *Refutatio*.

But, secondly, I see no evidence that Apollinaris was anything but a quartodeciman. He was bishop of Hierapolis, and as Philip of Hierapolis is the first of the Asiatic luminaries mentioned by Polycrates, it is probable that it was still a quartodeciman city, and had had a succession of quartodeciman bishops. We must add that Polycrates certainly implies that there was entire unanimity among the bishops in that region of the world. Schürer relies upon the fact that Apollinaris is not mentioned in the list which Polycrates gives of distinguished quartodecimans in his letter to Victor, though he was a celebrated man, while some of those who are named played no great part in the church.<sup>153</sup> But then Polycrates names only those who "have fallen asleep," and does not give the names of the "multitudes" of bishops who came together to consider the question, and signified their approval of his letter. Among the latter may have been Apol-

<sup>152</sup> Some of the chronologists seem to have taken the same view as the writer of the *Chron. Pasch.* See an anonymous extract in DINDORF, II, p. 118, and another in Latin, p. 222.

<sup>153</sup> *De cont. pasch.*, V, 1.

linaris, who was a contemporary of Irenæus,<sup>154</sup> and would not have been a very old man at the time.

Another item of evidence is furnished by the manner in which he speaks of those whose opinion he is combating. Hippolytus, living in the neighborhood of Rome, might easily fall into contemptuous language towards men whose numbers and weight were not familiar to him; but it is not likely that Apollinaris, unless he was a singularly conceited and ill-tempered man, would use similar language about all his brother bishops, including men of the greatest learning and distinction. Eusebius tells us that Melito, bishop of Sardis, wrote two books on the passover, and that these apparently were called forth by a discussion which arose at Laodicea about the passover, at the time when Sagaris was martyred, in the proconsulship of Servilius Paulus.<sup>155</sup> Of the nature of this discussion we are not informed; but as Sagaris and Melito were undoubtedly quartodecimans, and as we have no intimation that the church of Laodicea was ever anything else, it seems probable that the subject of debate was not connected with the quartodeciman practice. Clement's treatise was occasioned by that of Melito, but we are not told that it was an answer to it. The work of Apollinaris may have had the same origin, or it may have been an independent contribution to the Laodicean discussion. But supposing that it was an attack on the universal practice of the Catholic Christians of his country, is it likely that he would venture to ascribe to contentious ignorance the opinion of one of the most learned and orthodox bishops of his time? And if a man who set himself against the prevalent opinion and practice obtained a bishopric at all, would not such action have excited a storm, and made it impossible for Polycrates to assume, as he evidently does, that there was an unbroken unanimity in the Asiatic churches?

It is perhaps of small importance that Eusebius does not ascribe to Apollinaris any exceptional position; for he had not seen, and accordingly does not mention, his work on the passover. But if he had heard of any dissenting party in Asia

<sup>154</sup>EUSEB., *H. E.*, IV, 21.

<sup>155</sup>About 164-6. *H. E.*, IV, 26.

Minor, he would probably have noticed it; and we can hardly suppose that in the remonstrance addressed to Victor there would have been no allusion to this party, and no remark on his injustice in endeavoring "to cut off in the mass the dioceses of all Asia, together with the neighboring churches."<sup>156</sup>

Lastly, the glorification of the fourteenth day is just what we should expect in a quartodeciman. If the fourteenth was the day in which the true passover was sacrificed, and Christian redemption was brought in, surely that was the one day on which Christians ought to celebrate the feast. The only objection to this argument is the baseless hypothesis that the Asiatic passover was a commemoration, not of the passion, but of the last supper. That some quartodecimans distinctly professed to keep the feast on the day of the passion we learn independently from Epiphanius,<sup>157</sup> who tells us that they claimed to have found from the acts of Pilate that the Saviour suffered on the eighth day before the Kalends of April, and they wished to keep the passover on that day, whatever the fourteenth might be. Of course men who adopted such a custom really ceased to be quartodecimans; and there is no apparent reason why Epiphanius classed them under that head except that they wished to keep the precise anniversary of the crucifixion.

For these reasons, then, I believe that Apollinaris was a quartodeciman; and if so, we learn that quartodecimans, like other Christians, were divided in opinion about the order of events in the closing scenes of Christ's life. These conflicting opinions had nothing to do with the great question which separated the two parties, except so far as they were dragged into it by individual writers. If a quartodeciman believed that Jesus kept the regular Jewish passover, what more natural than to appeal to his example; if he believed that Jesus, being himself the paschal Lamb, was slain on the fourteenth, again what more natural than to appeal to this fact as marking the unalterable day for the Christian celebration? It is very probable that the majority on their side, as on the side of the western practice, accepted the synoptic dates, which are far clearer than the

<sup>156</sup> EUSEB., *H. E.*, V, 24.

<sup>157</sup> *Haer.*, L, 1.



Johannine, and in some way harmonized the latter with the former. The only distinct allusion to an inconsistency between the gospels on this point is in the first fragment of Apollinaris; but he does not say that the men whose ignorance he attacks maintained that the gospels were contradictory, but only that according to their view they seemed to be so. This is, to his mind, a conclusive argument, and it is pretty clear that he expects it to be equally conclusive to others. "The gospels" are evidently an accepted and authoritative collection, among which the thought of contradiction was inadmissible. No doubt the ignorant men were quite ready to retort the charge, and it would be interesting to know how Apollinaris managed to explain away the unambiguous language of Matthew. This practical ascription of infallibility to the evangelical records is in complete accordance with the results of our whole inquiry. The four gospels had been long in possession of the field as the most authentic documents of Christianity, and, as we have not found elsewhere, so neither can we find in the fragments of Apollinaris, the minutest particle of evidence that the Christians of Asia Minor looked askance at the gospel which was ascribed to the beloved disciple whose traditions still lingered among them.

This long inquiry has had chiefly an historical interest; but in throwing light upon the nature of early Christian practices, and on the mutual relations of parties, it has at the same time shown how untenable is the argument which is derived from quartodeciman usage against the Johannine authorship of the fourth gospel. The feast of the passover, as we have seen, was adopted by the Christian church, with such modifications as circumstances rendered desirable or necessary; and this being so, it was the most obvious and natural thing to keep it at the same time as the Jews, who were the custodians of the ancient law. John would follow the familiar custom; and although he would fill it with a Christian significance, and would probably, like Paul, recognize in Jesus the true paschal Lamb, by whose blood the new covenant between God and the world was sealed, he would see in this spiritual realization of a venerable symbol

no reason for altering a time which was settled by ancient prescription. On whatever day the crucifixion took place, it was associated with the passover, and that festival, with its changed meaning and its deep-rooted memories of the Beloved, would be always dear to his heart, and, as it returned year by year, would bring him ever fresh messages of world-wide grace and truth. The "feast of the Jews" had become the feast of the children of God; and he himself had looked upon the Lamb, and found in him a redemption from worse than Egyptian bondage. All this would have been easier and not more difficult, if Christ had been really crucified on the very day of the passover; but if we reject this as improbable, still we can see how the two events might become synchronous in thought, and the writer of the "spiritual gospel," in whose mind religious ideas are apt to clothe themselves in the form of visible facts, while the fact sometimes melts away into its religious meaning, might place together in his narrative two occurrences which, for him, were indissolubly associated. The appeal of some of his remote followers to our first gospel, in support of a practice which was alleged to be his, affords no evidence against this view, for the gospels, having been raised into a position of equal and divine authority, had become the hunting ground of polemics, and such arguments do not supply the reason for the observance, but are the after-thoughts of controversy. There is no tradition that John was guided by any of the considerations which were evoked in later times; and there is no ground for supposing that his respect for the familiar day was challenged till long after he had departed from the world. I am forced, therefore, to the conclusion that this celebrated argument against the Johannine authorship of our gospel rests on misconception, and, so far from being decisive of the question, does not possess the slightest validity.